STATECRAFT

WILLIAM SANDERSON

STATECRAFT

STATECRAFT

BY

WILLIAM SANDERSON

JN
234
192
.S3

METHUEN & CO. LTD.
36 ESSEX STREET W.C.
LONDON

First Published in 1927

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

S-562

AUTHOR'S NOTE

I HAVE to thank Lady Willoughby de Broke for allowing me to use the last chapter, which was originally intended to form part of a biography of the late Lord Willoughby de Broke, who properly understood and practised the art of patronage. I have also to thank the Editor of the "Nineteenth Century and After" for permission to use parts of my article "Chaos in Industry," published in October, 1925.

WILLIAM SANDERSON

6 STONE BUILDINGS
LINCOLN'S INN
1927

Ashland Theological Library
Ashland, Ohio

CONTENTS

PAGE

AUTHOR'S NOTE v

INTRODUCTION xi

PART I

PRINCIPLE IN ART AND POLITICS 1

PART II

THE LOST SECRETS OF STATECRAFT 9

CHAPTER

I. THE SECRET OF MEMORY 9

II. THE SECRET OF RACE 16

III. THE SECRET OF GOVERNMENT 24

IV. THE SECRET OF POWER 29

V. THE SECRET OF ORGANIZATION 32

VI. THE SECRET OF PROPERTY 35

(*a*) THE FEUDAL CONCEPTION OF PROPERTY
(*b*) REGULATION OF SERVICES
(*c*) SUCCESS OF THE ENGLISH SYSTEM
(*d*) THE REVOLT AGAINST REGULATIONS
(*e*) THE RESULT OF THE REVOLT

VII. THE SECRET OF ECONOMICS 51

PART III

ENGLISH TENDENCIES 59

CHAPTER

I. NATIONALISM 59

II. IMPERIALISM 69

PART IV

PAGE

THE INDEX OF ANARCHY 77

CHAPTER

I. THE ETHICS OF REBELLION 77
II. BIAS 84
III. THE ILLUSIONS OF INDIVIDUALISM . . 93
IV. THE ILLUSIONS OF SOCIALISM . . . 98
V. PURITANISM 101
VI. THEORY AND SOCIAL REFORM . . . 108
VII. TRADE UNIONS 122
VIII. THE MONEYED INTERESTS 128

PART V

THE NURTURE OF THOUGHT 139

INDEX 143

" The protection of the Liberty of Britain is a duty which they owe to themselves who enjoy it, to their ancestors, who transmitted it down; and to their posterity, who will claim at their hands this, the best birthright, and noblest inheritance of mankind."

BLACKSTONE

INTRODUCTION

" See I have set before thee Life and good and Death and evil."

THIS book is written about politics. Its aim is not to treat the subject exhaustively, but to plead for a serious examination of the motive and policy of the English Nation. Politics, which embraces all arts, crafts and sciences, which requires for its proper consideration all the best qualities of mind and character, has become since the Reformation the abused hack of those who live by appealing to the ignorance that prevails on the strength of the popular franchise. It has, in consequence, ceased to receive the respectful attentions of the learned.

The practice of opportunism and procrastination has been substituted for statecraft, and the word " politics " to most people signifies no more than the vulgar advertisement and sordid accompaniments of an election. As modern democracy has deliberately eliminated a specialized governing class, political capacity has steadily diminished just at the time when the increasing complexity of social life has so extended the scope of politics as to make greater calls upon that capacity.

This book invites consideration of the foundations and origin, as well as of the objects of politics, which can be studied in the light of experience. It aims at examining, first, the purpose that has moulded and will mould national policy; secondly, the records of experience, consisting of memories conscious and unconscious, written, inherited, and traditional; thirdly, present problems, with a view to finding by the light of memory solutions that will achieve the object of life.

The pursuit of these inquiries will lead to the examination of the lost secrets of statecraft and the axioms on which every political system has been based. As they that are whole need not a physician, it will cause no surprise to find that the literature and philosophy of civilization contains no treatise on the purpose and fundamental principles of corporate life. Classical culture attains its eminence only on the

condition that there is no call for an investigation of first principles; for such a call comes only when there is a consciousness of ill-health and disintegration. Such evils arise from inconsistency—a fault that is quite incompatible with the existence of a high standard of culture. In an age of culture men can afford to be nobly unconscious of the hidden foundations on which the social structure rests, as a healthy man is unconscious of his digestion; and their excursions into the realms of politics are unlikely to be sufficiently radical for a diagnosis of the social disease of modern democracy. There is remarkably little in English literature to assist the political inquirer, for the writers and politicians of the past two centuries have been content with a superficiality that is staggering. Continental thinkers have during the past two generations been rudely awakened to the consciousness that Puritanism, after capturing the moral and intellectual citadels of civilization, has uprooted every social principle and now threatens with final destruction not only the character, but the very physique, of the white races. Philosophers have in consequence directed their attention to fundamentals, and a revival of aristocratic thought all over the Continent has resulted in efforts to discover the purposes of politics. These first efforts have, of course, been very crude, and in Germany philosophers appear to have blundered into proximity to the truth, without being able to find an explanation. They have, for instance, groped after "race" as the dominating factor in politics; but, as they overlooked the bearings of memory and purpose, they failed to make themselves intelligible. It is to be hoped that English thought, if as usual tardy, may eventually be more lucid.

For the purpose of English political philosophy it is necessary to investigate the secrets that are essential to the well-being and permanence of any society. As these secrets have been entirely lost by every Western nation, the first necessity is to find out precisely *what they are.* The secret of race lies in instinct and purpose: and it cannot be discovered by merely investigating origin. Origin is itself dependent on and explained by purpose. It is necessary to investigate both in order to discover the key to history.

With regard to the secret of private property, the work of Maitland discovered the feudal motive, but incompletely explained the significance of the institution when utilized for local administration.

The secrets of organization and economics are easy to find, though the latter has been difficult to state. When the posthumously published papers of Lord Milner frankly stated that the moneyed interests in England were unpatriotic and hostile to the economic interests of productive industry, it became for the first time possible to put forward, under the auspices of a great reputation, the suggestions for investigating national economy that are contained in this book.

To examine these things is to follow the road laid by our ancestors; and so to follow up the victories of the past, not by ploughing the shifting sands of passing fashion, but by occupying and enjoying the boundless wealth of human experience.

STATECRAFT

PART I

PRINCIPLE IN ART AND POLITICS

THE objects or purposes of animal life are to live and multiply, and these form the basis of psychology. Purpose is deep-rooted and penetrates to the subconscious mind, affecting equally the instincts and the ratiocinative processes of the brain. It provides the impetus for every action, and all the arts and occupations of men are pursued for one or other of the two main objects. On the one hand art develops in the practice of war, hunting, agriculture, or competition in some productive activity, and on the other it is used in love for the pursuit, capture, or marriage of women. When in the nobler moulds of character and intellect, some crowning purpose of life springing from religious, artistic, or patriotic motives occupies the mind, emotion produces intense consciousness of refinements of purposes that are ever the same. Man is an individual animal before being religiously, artistically, or socially endowed, and his policies must ever conform to the maintenance of his physiological welfare and to the propagation of his kind. It is solely on condition that they so conform that he can attain such stability and permanence as to contemplate the acquisition of culture and the development of ideals. For in physique lie the foundations of art and manners and all else that make up the elegance of life.

Every rational action, whether individual or collective, is the outcome of two acts of deliberation, the first being concerned with the adoption of a purpose, and the second with the selection of a policy. There can be no policy without purpose; for a policy is a plan of action for the achievement of a purpose. Without a plan there can be no rational conduct. Action can be estimated only by reference to the end in view and the efficacy of the action in attaining it.

While the end does not necessarily justify the means, it is certain that it is only the end that can justify any means or policy. A policy cannot be good unless it tends to a good end; but, even if the end be good, the policy will be bad if not based on the principle of attaining it. As policy is the precedent of action, and purpose the precedent of policy, all action is to be valued by reference to its purpose or tendency. We cannot otherwise assess it than by using purpose as the measure of value.

As the problems of existence and continuance are the preoccupations of animal life, and the present precedes and moulds the future, the essentials of existence must be provided before the problems of continuance can be considered. If the problems of existence are not solved there can be no outcome to consider. Man must learn to provide himself with food and protection before he can contemplate domestic responsibilities. Food and shelter, the arts of war and hunting, of mutual defence and support, are the first considerations. The pursuit of food leads to appreciation of the combination of men for hunting, defence, and attack, and finally to patriotism, service, and honour. Hunger is the progenitor of social virtue. To appease it is the motive of masculine art. It is ever the first and supreme consideration. And as the present moulds the future, the solution of the problems of existence leads to effective consideration of those of continuance. War is the school of love, and successful competition, and co-operation among men provides the only effective training for relationship with women. Success in the latter is dependent on prowess in the former. In time of war we still remember this; and a man will, even in modern conditions, withdraw his protection from his wife and young children to fight for his country, knowing that they may die if he goes, but that they will almost certainly be destroyed if he does not go. The lines

> I could not love thee, dear, so much,
> Loved I not honour more,

not only embalm a correct relationship of emotions—they point to the very keystone of good taste. The pity is that it is only in calamity that we see it, and calamity comes because we forget. The first cause of degeneracy is the loss of aptitude for sexual selection, and capacity to recognize sexual values. Whereas no man should found a family till he has " won his

spurs " and attained his manhood according to standards of masculine virtue, it is considered sufficient justification for marriage if he is plentifully supplied with wealth accumulated by the efforts and under the protection of other men. While it is a good thing that wealth should accumulate in private hands, it is a good thing only because the wealth is power which can be utilized by men of good taste. Nothing is more difficult to learn than the effective exercise of such power. It is far more difficult to spend money properly and to administer wealth than to " make money " in business, and it is a general rule that those who have learnt the one lesson have neither time nor opportunity to learn the other. The man of good breeding and good taste knows that an inheritance is a responsibility, and that wealth involves a burden that must be honourably shouldered. The modern business man, with no standard but profit, has generally overlooked this point of view. Absorbed in the task of acquiring wealth, never having any time or opportunity to consider any use for it except to make more wealth, so hard-worked that the brief intervals from business must be used for recreation, the business man cannot be expected to become a great expert in the most difficult of all arts, that of creative statesmanship. And rare, indeed, are the exceptions to the rule that those who " make money " spend with bad taste. How great, then, is the folly of interfering with inheritance by death duties and so curtailing the opportunities of those who could acquire the arts of government. The nation requires a governing class, for no matter how general the knowledge of principle might become, by means of education, its application would still require as much genius in execution as painting a masterpiece or acquiring the technique of a Caruso.

No country can dispense with the services of a class which, secure in the possession of inherited wealth, can devote its energies to the creative art of statecraft. The possession of wealth is protected by law on the assumption that the possessor has the creative faculty. This faculty combined with the spirit of service supplies the only rational basis for the legal institution of private property. Combinations of men would consent to protect private ownership only on condition of service, and the individuals who performed the greatest services would be the most appreciated and have the greatest influence. Social virtue has always consisted in the performance of public service, and the natural masculine attitude

towards wealth is creative. From the first, the standard of taste must have been measured by positive service, and never by personal gain. Profit and loss are not measures of value, but merely cash balances between individuals and the community. They do not indicate whether a service has been rendered or not; and, often enough, a loss to an individual is a gain to the community, and vice versa. The only measure of value is service, and the standards of social virtue have always been based upon it. The invariable attitude of the aristocrat and the peasant to the trader, working only for profit, found expression in general disapproval of the policy of the younger Pitt in bestowing honours on persons who owed their position to exploitation rather than to service. When Mr. Fox Lane was offered the revival of the Bingley Peerage he refused to go into the House of Lords on the ground that it had become an assembly of successful traders; and in his protest he said that he was a gentleman and of ancient lineage, and " being one of the few old English families —a commoner (not a trader), of high birth and fortune, he piqued himself upon that." It is not, of course, that the occupation of trade is contemptible or that of war necessarily noble, for anyone can quote instances to the contrary; but military standards are based on service, while the standards of trade are those of profit and personal gain, and, as a rule, these standards are adhered to. The standards of the learned professions of medicine and law may approximate more nearly to those of aristocracy; but it must be very rarely the case that a trader can in a single lifetime acquire success in business and also develop those qualities which fit him to be enrolled as a member of the governing classes. The prejudice against the parvenu is, as a rule, justified.

The preoccupations concerned with maintaining existence and providing for the continuance of the race together explain the dual derivation of male instincts and traditions. Survival has always depended on seeing both in their proper perspective. The races which kept due proportion between these interests would outstrip and overcome those which allowed either the one or the other to be neglected or unduly encouraged. Food and honour, the social and political virtues, are more important than woman, and must take precedence of her in the masculine code. Where there is any conflict of interests, those of women must be postponed because they are dependent on prior considerations. Mark Antony has been

universally and rightly condemned for sacrificing his military and political ambitions to his love for Cleopatra, for in so doing he betrayed the interests of his race. That the world is well lost for love is a feminine, and not a masculine, valuation.

The very structure of the male body, with its atrophied mammary glands, indicates that man has survived by considering his own existence first, and, where necessary, sacrificing his offspring. The virile and successful type of male survived only because in case of necessity he ignored his offspring and threw the burden of rearing them on to the female.

The true basis of masculine psychology is attention to war, or competition, and absolute postponement of love until this attention has resulted in success. Thus the psychology of the most desirable masculine type is made up of a combination of instincts and traditions derived both from politics and sex. These act and react upon each other, and good taste depends on subordinating the sexual to the social elements.

The complication of interests that give rise to male psychology [1] is in strong contrast to the homogeneous nature of woman. However important the influence of sex in the male it is of secondary importance; but it absorbs the whole female nature. It is apparent that to a woman food is of far less concern than adornment. The modern shop-girl or typist, with low wages, goes short of food to buy finery, in obedience to the oldest and soundest of the instincts by which women have in all ages sought to barter their sex for their safety. Thus women are principally occupied with the art of adornment. Those who succeed are provided with food and protection. The failures must fend for themselves by going into competition with men, when they lose much of the quality of sex as well as their value to the race. As they become adapted to industrial competition they become neutralized. Though the champions of feminism have attempted to show that girls can be athletes and then undertake regular and constant work like men, without suffering or damage to their efficiency, these views are erroneous, and the overwhelming weight of scientific evidence is against them. The exigencies of feminine nature render it impossible for women to work regularly at industrial employments without damage to their physique. Women are apt to boast

[1] The best book on this subject is Ludovici on Man (Constable).

that they have won independence, when in reality their vital interests have been ignored. Society shirks the problem, and trusts, by making the whole subject taboo, to keep it well out of sight.

Women can be employed in industry only at the cost of neutralizing or destroying them. For the instincts of woman have a simple homogeneous source. Her instincts, as well as her emotions are entirely sexual, like the structure of her body. She has a total ineptitude for politics, for she lacks political virtue. Having no social instincts she can develop no intellectual capacity for constructive art or organization. Her opinions are but critical reactions from personal experience. Where they are not degenerate, these reactions are interesting and useful, but they will not give rise to the creative faculty; and it is dangerous to give women the franchise or to allow their opinions to prevail.

It is only so long as taste is based on masculine virtue that society can develop on healthy lines. The defects now so apparent in modern democracies are caused by a reversal of the standards of taste. This gives rise to fatal tendencies which begin when men cease to regard wealth as calling for the exercise of their creative energies and to look upon it as merely an advantage to the individual possessor. The pursuit of wealth for the sake of pleasure leads to the capture of women for the mere gratification of desire. With men who have lost the tradition of masculine virtue the neutralized woman can often compete either in industry or in politics. It is not surprising that claims of political equality between the sexes arise in individualist communities. They spring, not from the greater ability of women, but from the absence of masculine virtue. The fact that these claims arise means that the community has ceased to produce men of the right calibre.

America, the most individualist country in the world, affords the most striking illustrations of these fatal tendencies. There has never been a tradition of national service connected with wealth in America, and the acquisition of dollars has been the sole standard of business success. This has destroyed the masculine outlook and has led to the disproportionate influence of women. For individualism involves the cessation of the characteristically masculine social functions. Civilization has, in consequence, lost its balance. The interests and ambitions of men have no purpose but

to minister to spoiled women; and Liberty has become a synonym for feminine prohibitions. The interests of the race are not considered, and the white population is, in consequence, already threatened with extinction. Professor William Starr Myers, successor to President Wilson in the chair of History and Politics at Princeton University, declared that only twenty million out of the one hundred and five million people in the United States could be classed as intellectual. The best psychological, biological, and other tests showed that forty-five million of the population were subnormal, with intellects equal to that of a juvenile of fourteen years. Fifteen million were feeble-minded, with the mental equipment of children. Any close *rapprochement* with America, if it involves, as it must necessarily do, interchange of ideas and mutual modification of culture, must be injurious to England, for a country that retains but the vestiges of sound traditions cannot afford even a flirtation with one that is given over to a vicious taste. England's salvation lies in the revival and fostering of her national traditions with jealous care, and in remembering that even religion, if it is to be real, must find a national expression, in alliance with standards of morality consonant with the purpose of national politics. Every nation has its own purpose to serve, its own memories to guide it, and if these are mixed with others nothing but confusion can follow. Our hope lies in a return to masculine standards of taste. Whether it is now possible, by careful breeding and a return to our traditions, to restore masculine characteristics may be doubtful, for the nation in its degeneracy may have left Past Redemption Point in its wake. But whether it is possible or not, nothing else in life is worth doing unless it is accomplished.

PART II

THE LOST SECRETS OF STATECRAFT

CHAPTER I

THE SECRET OF MEMORY

THE most learned writers on English politics have adopted the expression *body politic* to describe the social structure composed of all the human beings who make up an organized nation. The expression is natural to those who regard an organized mass actuated by a common purpose as analogous to a living organism. The value of the analogy has been sufficiently discussed by Maitland,[1] and it has certainly led to a happier and more natural phrase than the term *state*, which is generally used to describe a fictitious entity supposed to exist quite apart from the human beings who compose the nation. A *state* is merely a creature of law, but the *body politic* is a real living thing which has grown and developed to its present size and shape and exists apart from any law or theory. Its roots and origin are in the past and not in any document; its objects are in the future, and its composition is changing every minute with the birth, growth, and death of all the individual members of which it is made up. The body politic is a sensitive living thing that cannot be moulded by theorists, but must obey the natural laws that brought it into existence. To understand its structure we must study its origin and growth. The past alone can supply the key to present problems, and therefore the statesman who is the physician of the body politic, must study and understand its history.

The difficulty that confronts English statesmen is that there is no comprehensive and intelligent history of England or the English race. There are, indeed, records of events, mostly unhappy events, tabulated in order, with the essential facts which could supply an explanation almost invariably garbled

[1] "The Body Politic": Collected Papers, Vol. III.

or omitted. There are numerous so-called "histories," such as that recently published by Trevelyan, written under the influence of extreme Liberal bias, and others which are but special pleading in which facts are distorted to justify the theories and prejudices of their writers.

The dearth of national history was noticed by Disraeli, who, writing [1] in 1845, thus commented upon it:

> "If the history of England be ever written by one who has the knowledge and the courage—and both qualities are equally requisite for the undertaking—the world would be more astonished than when reading the Roman annals by Niebuhr. Generally speaking all the great events have been distorted, most of the important causes concealed, and some of the principal characters never appear; and all who figure are so misunderstood and misrepresented that the result is a complete mystification, and the perusal of the narrative about as profitable to an Englishman as reading the Republic of Plato or the Utopia of More, the pages of Gaudentio di Lucca, or the adventures of Peter Wilkins.
>
> "The influence of races in our early ages, of the church in our middle, and of parties in our modern history, are three great moving and modifying powers, that must be pursued and analysed with an untiring, profound and unimpassioned spirit, before a guiding ray can be secured. A remarkable feature of our written history is the absence in its pages of some of the most influential personages. Not one man in a thousand, for instance, has ever heard of Major Wildman: yet he was the soul of English politics in the most eventful period of this kingdom, and one of the most interesting in his age, from 1640 to 1688; and seemed more than once to hold the balance which was to decide the permanent forms of our Government. He was the leader of an unsuccessful party. Even comparatively speaking, in our own times, the same mysterious oblivion is sometimes encouraged to creep over personages of great social distinction as well as political importance."

If it be necessary to justify this passage, it is enough to point to the evidence set out in Ludovici's "Defence of Aristocracy," which has been generally ignored by the historians, though it is essential to a correct estimate of the

[1] "Sybil, or The Two Nations."

policy of Charles I. The ignorance or suppression of the facts has resulted in the prevalence of opinions about the political struggles of the seventeenth century, which are as false as they are ubiquitous. The orthodox method is to write and teach history with a pronounced Whig bias, and in consequence Charles I is condemned as a tyrant because he taxed traders, while Henry VIII, who really was a dangerous and unscrupulous tyrant, is praised for throwing the nation open to exploitation. The history of the nineteenth century has been similarly distorted, and the youth of the country are impressed with entirely erroneous views of the Corn Laws and of the fatuous policy of Sir Robert Peel. During this generation the University of Oxford has published a political history in which no reference is made to the Truck Act,[1] the most important industrial reform of last century.

While bias, accident, and prejudice account to some extent for the inadequacy of our written history, there is a more important explanation which leads to the omission of records of constructive success. An ancient proverb says that happy is the nation that has no history; and another that the best thing we can hear of a woman is nothing at all; and it is a fact that happiness has no history. We can gather that a nation was prospering at periods when great poets sang, but we can find no direct records of it. Happiness is a condition which is not induced by incident and leaves nothing to record. For incident results from effort, and effort is made to adjust something troublesome. It is a striving after adaptation in response to a feeling of pain or discomfort. If there is no trouble, there is nothing to talk about. Complete happiness finds its expression in song, and it is the man with a grievance who writes to "The Times." Thus it is the socialist who tells us all about the faults of private property. When the institution was on its trial in the constitutional crisis of 1911 the House of Lords could not produce a champion for the institution, not even Lord Halsbury himself, who could say clearly what constructive principle it embodied. When a nation is forced by trouble and misery to seek a remedy for failure it turns to investigate the causes of success, and in the effort to become self-conscious struggles to recall the unrecorded past. The fact that a complete record is needed is then appreciated for the first time; for it is manifestly impossible to treat of politics, except in the light of history.

[1] 1 and 2 Will. IV, c. 37. See p. 118, *infra*.

The individualist, the socialist, the theorist of any type can ignore the past and the future. But the student of statecraft who is entrusted with the health of the social organism must safeguard the present as a link between the past and future, and so must plunge deeply into the causes of institutions. The most important institutions are the family and private property; and it is astonishing that their real significance has never yet been adequately dealt with in literature. It is the object of this book to indicate the motives of both institutions and to plead for an adequate history and a complete treatise of the politics of the English nation.

Life depends on the retention of memory. When tradition is broken and disorder and decay set in, reference to written history becomes a matter of urgent necessity, to discover the meaning and purpose of national life, and the method by which policies for attaining it can be applied. Without history it is impossible for a statesman to appreciate the tendencies of politics as he should. It is a test of good statesmanship to be able to foretell accurately the consequences of policies and the course of events; and politics can be such an exact science that there can be no excuse for being taken by surprise. It is the function of historians to record all policies and experiments in government, so that later generations may not waste energy in repeating the failures of the past.

While, however, a knowledge of the history of immediately preceding ages is essential to the statesman who would understand the present, that knowledge can be complete only if supplemented by remoter experience and the memories of things too old for history to note. It is not only in the written record or in architecture that memory is enshrined; but for the most part it is in the instincts and traditions. All instincts, customs, habits, and laws have been laboriously worked out and acquired in the limitless immemorial past. In every instinct, as illustrated by subconscious action, resides a carefully conserved memory of events and experiments dating back beyond the dawn of history. Experiences of a less remote date have given rise to traditions, inchoate instincts, which have been handed down to form the basis of present customs and habits. These are the national memories that must be conserved if health and prosperity are to be retained. Policies can be reasonably framed only in the light of past experience—the tail light shown by our ancestors to illuminate the road over which they have passed. Experience

is the only sure guide that enables men to step forward with confidence, and therefore the memory of experience must be preserved. Any nation that ceases to be conservative must perish; for conservatism is the political theory of progress by the light of memory.

Political progress must consist in the accumulation of memories, and is therefore identified with conservatism. "Progress" is a word that has been much abused as a label for policies based on ephemeral doctrines and theories which have no connexion with the past or future of the race, and, as coming from nowhere, leading nowhere, should not be so described. Maine's famous definition of progress as a movement from status to contract served its purpose for two generations, but, as will be shown later,[1] no longer holds good, owing to the tendencies towards status which have been given tremendous impetus in the past twenty years.

Political progress is in fact increase of knowledge and power. The price of experience is so high that it becomes stamped on the memories of contemporaries. At each step forward experiments are made and their success or failure is remembered or recorded. Eventually a code of rules, many of them written in the blood of pioneers, grows into a policy adopted by the community as a tradition. In early times conduct was thus guided by custom, and primitive man was hedged about with prohibitions. Fears of the unknown were generally the foundations of these prohibitions. Adventure led to experiment, and experiment to tradition. A new departure is full of danger; but what has been done once may possibly be done again, and what has been done often may be done safely. Thus does tradition lead the way from the negative prohibition to the positive custom, and prohibitive sanctions are introduced to prevent any departure from the custom. While the prohibitions that are based on fear and inexperience are sanctioned by caution and superstition, the prohibitions which aim at maintaining custom and are based on experience are sanctioned by the deliberate and combined force of the community. The element of enforcement thus added to custom converts custom into positive law. After law has been enforced for a considerable time it becomes a habit even more rigidly observed than the law, for it entirely dispenses with sanctions. The final stage in which memory is incorporated in the human character is reached when habit

[1] See p. 117, *infra*.

has become so ingrained in nature that it is transmitted to offspring and becomes an inherited instinct. This is the genealogy of instincts, whose vitalizing essence is memory and the records of the past. The oldest memories are called instincts, and the parents of instincts are habits, and the parents of habits are laws, and the parents of laws are sometimes and ought always to be traditions. It is to be regretted that statute law is sometimes based on a theory or an act of tyranny, not on tradition. Such laws throw the machinery of society out of gear, and invariably fail. Conservatism implies progress, and there is nothing in it hostile to experiment. What a Conservative can guard against is rash experiment in legislation. The only justification of parliamentary government is that it may enable experts in statecraft to advise as to which of a nation's memories is ripe enough to found a law. The modern plan of forcing undigested theories on unprepared populations springs from total ignorance of statecraft. Tradition, custom, law, habit, and instinct should all be consonant. Any discord will tend to produce disorder.

As memory matures through the stages of tradition, custom, law, habit, and instinct there is progress from consciousness to subconsciousness. The things man knows best and has known longest become buried in his instincts; and the extent of this subconscious knowledge, which, if there is progress on consistent lines, is always increasing, is far greater than the extent of the knowledge of which he is conscious. The whole field of science is small compared with the vast range of knowledge incorporated in healthy, well-bred men.[1]

The derivation of instinct demonstrates the supreme importance of conduct, health, and heredity. Great civilizations have been produced by good mating and by breeding specialized types of men; for knowledge is best preserved in the family and the caste. Statecraft, in particular, can be fostered by breed. At one time it was universally recognized that the hereditary principle in government was essential to success. Now that it is challenged throughout the world, it can be defended on philosophic and scientific grounds. Liberal thought has been based on the fundamental blunder of ignoring the principles of growth and the experience of the

[1] "The conscience of man is simply the voice of his ancestors in his breast; and he should remember that he has it in his power to weaken or strengthen that voice for his off-spring and for their off-spring. For just as virtues may be reared, so, as Aristotle points out, they may be destroyed at will."—"Defence of Aristocracy" by Ludovici.

past. It has therefore overlooked the importance of breed, the outcome of the process of improving the physique and character by absorbing memories of a consistent nature. Breeds are distinguished by their different memories, and the experiences which have produced varying characteristics. Health and breed temper the mind, and if both are pure prepare it for the reception of conscious standards of good taste. Thus it desires and selects the best, and leads to the rule of the best—aristocracy.

Progress is therefore the increase and accumulation of knowledge and results in improvement of breed. To ensure such progress is the object of national politics.

The education of masses of people in the mere paraphernalia of learning, without any effort to inculcate tradition or preserve instinct, is destroying race memories, as it has obviously destroyed skill. Instead of being a country of craftsmen, England has become a land of unskilled labourers, as was proved in the general strike of 1926, when the so-called "skilled" workers were in a few days replaced by volunteers with no previous training, who did the work quite as well as those regularly engaged in it. Politics have been reduced to the same low level, and the amateur and professional alike blunder on without the slightest grasp of principle or any conception that statecraft is both a science and an art.

CHAPTER II

THE SECRET OF RACE

THE hereditary transmission of memory leads to the development of feature and character. Common origin involves common memories of previous experience, and is the distinguishing mark of breed, for stock with a common origin is said to be of the same breed. The common experiences of all of the same breed produce a distinct type of feature and character. By good mating—that is to say, mating between people with consistent or similar memories—the memories of these common experiences can be conserved and strengthened and the characteristics intensified and improved. The experience of stock-breeders, the conclusions of science, and the witness of history alike prove that whatever is characteristic of a particular breed—whether virtue or vice, strength or weakness—will be increased and intensified by the mating of similar types. On the other hand, the mating of persons of dissimilar breeds produces confusion of memory, and results in weakness and vacillation of character. Progress can be maintained only by purity of breed, for so only can there be consistency. Breed can be maintained only by good mating.

Distinctions of breed consist in distinctions of memory, caused by the various occupations and experiences of different groups. Life among trees resulted in a breed of dwarfs, while life on the plains produced giants. The offspring of a giant and a dwarf must have contradictory memories, and, in consequence, the unbalanced character of the mongrel. Being cut off from the knowledge of the past such offspring starts *de novo* with none of the specialized instincts, and incapable of acquiring the specialized traditions of giant or dwarf. It must start again with the loss of all specialized knowledge. Thus progress is retarded by mixture of breed. Stock-breeders know that the object of crossing breeds is to curtail propensities, never to improve them. Science is now able to confirm this knowledge.

Thus progress is maintained by proper standards of taste

in sexual selection and mating. Unsuccessful mating is destructive of breed and extinguishes knowledge, of which type is the embodiment. Mixed breeding and bad mating is progressively on the increase, and in consequence distinctions of type and standards of culture are rapidly disappearing. The capacity to choose a mate is apparently declining, and is resulting in an ever-increasing number of unsuccessful marriages where there are no children, or diseased children, or general unhappiness. The loss of capacity to select is both the cause and the effect of loss of knowledge due to mixture of breed. The remedy is obvious; but it cannot possibly be applied, and therefore the population problem cannot be directly tackled by statecraft. All that can be done is to inculcate the principles of good mating into the well-bred people who still survive, and trust that in the course of two or three generations families will be founded which will gradually restore healthy and vigorous types. The knowledge is available to anyone who will put it into practice, while no argument and no knowledge will assist those who are satisfied with existing methods of selection.

Why is it, then, that pure breeds develop and then disappear? Why is it that animals and birds invariably breed true to type, and that men sometimes do and sometimes do not? Why is it, for instance, that the House of Lords [1] owed its origin and success to good mating, and now owes its failure and threatened extinction to cross-breeding? It is obvious that breeds depend on origin. What, then, is the secret of its retention, and how can it be restored? This question must be answered, because it does not matter what else happens if we are to be utterly destroyed.

The secret is to be found in the philosophy of action, for every sane action is taken in pursuance of a policy for the attainment of a definite purpose. Thus in war and love it is the purpose that moulds the policy. Isolated men come together because they see that co-operation will help them to attain the purpose each has in view. In the pursuit of the common purpose they gain common experience, common aptitudes, and increasing similarities of speech and method. When they meet they are of different breeds; but as time goes on and their offspring intermarry and accumulate an

[1] Over five hundred peers have been created since 1825, and the House had already become degraded by the Pitt creations. Very few of the peers created in the nineteenth century were selected for breed or capacity for statecraft.

ever-increasing store of common memories, similarity of feature and character begins to appear, and a new breed has been evolved in pursuance of a definite purpose. Without the purpose there could be no common origin, possibly no origin at all. For it is inconceivable that there can be unity without an objective. No doubt the objective is invariably the acquisition of food, security, and a home. The purpose being in the main the same, the development of different breeds proceeds in the main on similar lines. The distinguishing characteristics are created by reaction to environment and occupation. Thus origin and experience explain physiological distinctions of breed, and are themselves explained by ethical considerations. There is no cohesion without an objective; for faith is the parent of hope and inspires the policy that leads to co-operation.

As individuals unite to attain an objective and by their union give rise to a breed, so breeds unite to attain an objective and by their union establish a race. Races, composed of many breeds, are distinguished by feature and character developed by experience and explained by purpose. A race is a combination of breeds which have had common experiences in pursuit of a common purpose. The original motive that leads to amalgamation and unity is the important consideration, for it will eventually modify or create feature and character. Synthetic tendencies are produced by the conception of common motives and the adoption of common policies.

In considering the growth of race through the stages of individualism, breed, and finally patriotism there is a constant succession of purpose and origin—purpose explaining origin and origin giving rise to purpose. It is no easier to decide which comes first than to answer the similar question regarding the hen and the egg. Scientists have confined their attentions to origin and environment. To statesmen the ethical conception of the purpose of the race is more significant than either. Whatever its origin, a race is manifestly an instrument forged in the furnace of experience for the attainment of a definite purpose. If the purpose fails the race must disappear, not necessarily by the extinction of all its human offspring, but by the loss of its distinctive features and characteristics. As feature and character develop in accordance with the functions required for the attainment of purpose, so they are lost if the purpose ceases or is changed.

S-56269

As a well-bred man will mate only with a particular type, if the purpose that produced the purity of his breed remains alive within him as a living faith, so he will mate carelessly or for a mere whim if he has no purpose at all; for it is only where there is an object that there will be a consistent policy. The importance of maintaining breed has been pointed out again and again, and the authorities on this point have been so well cited by Ludovici [1] that it is unnecessary again to argue the point. The maintenance and development of racial traits cannot be lost if the race breeds true. It will breed true if it keeps its faith; but the encroachment of false ideas will give rise to false politics in education and economics, and will lead to mixture of blood, confusion of memories, and the deterioration of physique and character.

The controversies of the scientists as to the meaning of the word "race" have been summed up by Pitt Rivers, but these do not greatly assist the statesman, for whom this word has several meanings, all sufficiently precise. In the expressions the "human race," the "Teutonic race," the "Jewish race," the adjectives modify, rather than qualify, the meaning of the noun. There are several distinct meanings, all justified by the customary use of language, and there is no risk of confusion between them. No one has any doubt as to what is meant by "human race," or any difficulty in distinguishing the equally accurate but more restricted expression "English race." The word "Englishman" describes a type of man easily recognizable by his appearance, speech, manners, and conduct. These characteristics are unmistakable and inimitable. They include innumerable variations of breed; for in every district in England there are Englishmen with minor differences of feature, colour, speech, and tone, as differences of environment or occupation have created them.

The scientist and the politician have been equally ineffective in treating this subject. The scientist, with his mind concentrated solely on origin, has denied that there is any such thing as an English race or a Jewish race. The ground of this contention is that the English originate in a mixture of stocks from all over Europe; and the modern Jews, being brachycephalic, cannot be descendants of the Israelites of Old Testament times, who were dolichocephalic. Neither of these contentions disturb the conception of the English or

[1] "Defence of Aristocracy," Chapter VII.
[2] "The Clash of Culture."

Ashland [illegible]
Ashland, Ohio

the Jews as identified races, because the English were welded into a pure race by adopting a common purpose; and the Jews might well change from a long-headed noble type to a round-headed usurious type since they abandoned the pastoral and warlike philosophy of the Old Testament and took to intrigue and finance. It is, however, absurd to contend that the race characteristics of the English or the Jews are not clearly marked and easily distinguishable.

The politician, on the other hand, ignores all physiological and ethical considerations and includes in the English race all who have acquired legal citizenship. The son of a naturalized alien standing for Parliament described himself to the electors in broken English as "an Englishman, born and bred," and succeeded in getting damages for libel from a critic who suggested that even if a cat kittens in a fish-basket its offspring will not become herrings. Yet the fish-basket theory of nationality, reminiscent of the Don Pacifico incident, is the basis of accepted legal doctrine. The statesman cannot accept the scientific view of race which ignores the distinguishing purpose and the consequent features of race, nor the legal definition of an Englishman, in so far as it includes anyone whose appearance or speech gives rise to doubts as to his origin.

The characteristics of the English race were produced by the social genius of the English. The type was extremely masculine, and highly selected for war. This resulted in a devotion to the idea of service, which, as we have seen, is the outcome of essentially masculine instincts. The fact that Britain is an island enhanced the traditions of service, because those who reached these shores must have been not only great soldiers, but great seamen as well. As naval discipline is necessarily more rigid than military discipline, life at sea requiring more constant co-operation in the face of graver dangers than are encountered on land, the sea helped in no small measure to mould our character and civilization. The type that possessed the dominant English instincts was evidently descended from northern latitudes, and was fair-haired and blue-eyed. So universal was this type in Tudor times that we are told a dark-haired man who appeared in the streets of London was mobbed by the curious. Three centuries later the type has become so rare that Pitt Rivers [1] does not hesitate to say that the race which was the English

[1] "The Clash of Culture."

race in the reign of Elizabeth has almost disappeared, and what remains must be regarded as a vanishing race.

This is the latest opinion of modern anthropologists, and accords exactly with the expectations of statesmen. The English type was developed under the influence of very powerful motives which brought about the amalgamation of particular breeds in pursuit of a line of progress developed by the ideals of service. It was bound to decay and disappear if these motives were changed or ceased to operate. By the time of the Crusades we know that the race was superior in prowess to any other in Christendom. Then the ideals of service were allowed to decay, and, at the Reformation, the safeguards under which the English type had been developed were relaxed in favour of breeds engaged in trade. The aim of these breeds being personal gain and individualism could be pursued only under the protection of those who performed services. It is not paradoxical to say that it was the very completeness of success in service that fostered the opposite ideal of individualism in England. It is only the Anglo-Saxon race that could dare to contemplate or practise the vice of individualism as we have done. The individualism of Rome was diluted with ideals of service. English individualism is pure unadulterated vice.

The opposing ideals of service and of gain came into political conflict in the Civil War, and the concomitant physiological conflict of races was appropriately reflected in the sobriquet "Roundheads," applied to the individualist followers of Cromwell. The features and character of the race have certainly been undergoing fundamental changes in conformity with the political and economic revolution which began in the reign of Henry VIII, and has been completed only at the present day. Legally the revolution was completed with the passing of the Companies Acts, 1860 to 1908, the Trade Disputes Act, 1906, the Settled Land Acts, and the new property laws of 1925. The law has followed national policies, and these policies have suppressed and modified race types, which cannot survive in modern industrial conditions in competition with mixed or semitic breeds devoted to the ideal of exploitation.

As purpose moulds policy, the appearance of conflicting ideals in a nation necessarily results in conflicting policies. With or without civil war one ideal must dominate the others, for inconsistent aims and policies cannot be simultaneously

pursued. Purpose decides direction, and a nation cannot move in two directions at once any more than an animal. When exploitation was substituted for service as the aim of national politics, the older ideal was not at once wholly extinguished. It could, however, merely retard the process of disintegration without stopping it. There must be a decisive tendency in favour of one ideal or the other. It is not only the antiquated critic with a bee in his bonnet who will find fault with every phase of modern civilization; for in sober truth it must all be wrong, or none of it. This is a most efficient age for achieving its objectives. Minor faults there may be in the machinery. But they get very quickly remedied. There is little excuse for criticism of modern parliamentary and industrial methods for achieving the ideals of democracy. If the ideals are right, then we live in an ideal age, for, as far as humanly possible, those ideals have been reduced to practice. If, on the other hand, we quarrel with the ideals, we shall not criticize the system piecemeal, but condemn it wholesale. According to our ideals, either all is well, or nothing is well. Which is it? The answer depends on the point of view. If we look at it from the race standpoint, there is nothing in modern civilization of which we can approve. Its motive and intention being racially destructive, every single part of its industry, its art, its literature, its religion, and its habits must be wrong. Individuals, here and there, may be pursuing noble ideals and, in consequence, doing good things. To them we owe the remnant of pure breed, to which alone we can look with any hope of race revival. It is the whole tendency of national policy and law that is wrong. At Agincourt the English displayed great superiority over continentals. No such superiority could be claimed for the English in the last war, though continental physique had certainly not improved. All that had been gained by centuries of good breeding, good feeding, and sound policies had, by the reign of George V, been lost. Those who are familiar with the history of the change of diet as a solitary cause of decline will not be surprised at the result. It was consistent with the pursuit of individualist ideals that the Puritans should introduce a systematic policy for lowering the standards of physique by diminishing the quality of diet; for the parasite desires to reduce the stamina of its host.

The result is that the English race, which flourished and progressed up to the Civil War, has now almost completely

lost its distinguishing characteristics, and must vanish if it continues to pursue industrial ideals. It is not necessary to be a very profound philosopher to see that the ideal of individualism causes degeneration of race and national disintegration.

Instinct has warned the working-classes of the tendency of this policy, and has caused them to make such efforts to revolt against it as their dispirited condition will allow.[1]

Thus, during the age of party government in England, while the politicians have been carrying on an artificial struggle for their own personal ends, there has been a real conflict and tragic strife between the two ideals of service and exploitation. This conflict of ideals has resulted in no mere party or economic division of interests, but has consisted of a conflict of morals, of temperament, and of race. Readers of Disraeli are familiar with his idea that the English race was sharply divided into two separate nations.[2] "Their civilizations are not two stages in the same civilization, but two civilizations, two traditions, which have grown up concurrently." It would have been more accurate to say that the English nation has for three centuries been composed of two races pursuing hostile and incompatible ideals. The conflict between the two has brought the original English race to the verge of extinction, though it has not yet been completely destroyed, and the ideal of service remains alive. And so long as we are not "cotton-spinners all," so long will a nucleus of English breeds be retained. Abandonment of the ideals of service will involve the extinction of the last remnants of these breeds. The point to remember is that so long as any well-bred people survive the race can be re-created, with all its noblest characteristics, by reviving the ideal of service which originally inspired it.

[1] See "Puritanism," p. 101, *infra*.

[2] "Sybil, or the Two Nations."

CHAPTER III

THE SECRET OF GOVERNMENT

THAT the policy of every action must be based on the principle of attaining a particular object is surely an axiom for men and nations. The purpose of life supplies the *raison d'être* of breeds and races, and so gives rise to political aspirations. The breed or race conceives a political objective, which forthwith becomes the aim and purpose of its politics. In the purpose of politics lies the secret of government. Government consists in the elaboration of policies and in putting them into operation. A statesman must have a correct appreciation of the end in view, the ability to apply principles consistently, and the influence to get the resulting policies carried into operation.

As to a correct appreciation of purpose, it is clear that a statesman must have access to the memories of the race. Politics is not a subject on which one opinion is as good as another. Opinions depend very much on temper, and they cannot be right unless held by a generous and vigorous man. A dyspeptic man, or one with a base or dull mind, cannot hold sound opinions. Nor can opinions on the sociology of a race be rightly formed by persons not belonging to the race,[1] for an alien's instincts and memories are inconsistent with the race memories enshrined in its traditions and institutions. Nor is there any room for differences of opinion about the purpose of politics. It is the duty of the statesman to avoid mere opinions and to select and apply the right principles with unerring decision and taste; for, if he fails, he will lead his race to destruction. It is with regard to purpose that feeling is sharply divided; and, because it is the vital concern of life, the division causes passion to run deep. The division may appear to be caused by disagreement over policies, but is really something far deeper. Opinion is never sharply divided over mere policies, for these are but roads to an end;

[1] Neglect of this principle has largely deprived modern education of any real value, and has made at least one School of Economics a fertile hotbed of revolution.

and we do not press to a quarrel a difference of opinion as to the best road to London, unless we secretly have some other destination in view.

Politics is a science in that it is an accumulation of reasoned knowledge, and an art in that it is the traditional method of putting knowledge into practice. Both the science and the art are moulded and conditioned by purpose. The purpose may not always be recognized, but it must always exist, and to attain it will be the principle that willy-nilly controls conduct in every department of national life. Whatever the object is, whether consciously adopted or not, it will control every policy. If the object is changed, it is not only policy, but breed and race, that must change also. A man of principle is one whose policies are directed to his avowed purpose. An unprincipled man is one who pretends to go in one direction while in fact going in another. A man must follow his actual purpose. That is why character is so much more important than intellect. All parties in Parliament since 1897, or earlier, have been unprincipled because they have pursued Liberal-Socialist policies while pretending otherwise.

It is the consistent application of principle that can alone make the life of a man or a nation prosperous and happy, for art and culture come from devotion to a definite ideal. Compromise can have no effect but to stultify effort, to stop or divert the current of life. It is like an attempt to walk in two directions at once, and indicates lack of faith. No one will compromise who believes in his own cause; and nations decay by compromise, but grow in war. The desire to compromise implies that faith in purpose—the motive of life—is already dead, and that life itself might just as well be over. It is better in every way that a cause should be totally extinguished, while its adherents fight to the death, than survive in a maimed form through cowardice.

From the Norman Conquest to Tudor times English unity and development was due to the unanimity with which the purpose of making a nation was pursued, and the ability with which policies were evolved. If not politically unanimous, England was so firmly governed that the opposing elements produced no discord, and a system was evolved and developed with little interruption. For a long time after the harrying of the North by the Conqueror there would be little to encourage political agitators to trust their ambitions to

policies of home rule, while feudalism tended to exterminate the class of person who departed from tradition in any craft or industry. The individual had little chance of airing his eccentric opinions, for he was not represented and had no recognized interest in affairs beyond his personal duty to serve the institution to which he belonged. It may be assumed that there was almost complete political unanimity, because there was but one religious faith. Speaking of heretics, Maitland says: "We may say with some confidence that during this long period [1222-1400] if English orthodoxy had a victim, there is no known record of his fate. . . . It must not surprise us if English law had no well-settled procedure for cases of heresy; there had been no heretics."[1] The feudal system produced in England something as nearly approaching national unanimity as can be found in history. This led to the consistent application of principles from which the greatness of our system was derived.

This inevitable consistency of policy is not always apparent; for during times of transition, when a culture that has grown up as the expression of an earlier ideal is dying and giving place to policies adapted to new ends, there will be warring elements until the new policies attain to a complete dominance over the old. Thus during the period of party government in England two warring races, with hostile objects, have given an appearance of inconsistency to our politics and laws. Despite this appearance, however, there has been, for more than two centuries, a dominating, overriding consistency in favour of individualistic ideals; and this has been observable in legislation, art, science, industry, and economics. It has profoundly modified religion; and English Christianity in the twentieth century, though nominally the same as in the fifteenth, is actually based on a fundamentally different conception. This change has come over thought and action consistently with the change, from the philosophy of service to the body politic, to the doctrines of exploitation and individualism. It is a normal accompaniment of the evolution of human action.

Government may be conducted by one or other of two methods. Where the purpose to be attained is accepted by a race and in accordance with its instincts it is easy to govern through tradition. Statecraft can dispense with force except

[1] "The Deacon and the Jewess, or, Apostacy at Common Law": Collected Papers, Vol. I.

for the punishment of crime. This is probably the main reason why the legislation of the early and most successful systems was confined to brief penal codes, these systems being allowed to develop by the steady growth of unwritten traditional law. Traditions develop naturally and automatically; and while, for the purpose of civil justice, they require judicial interpretation, they stand in no need of legislative interference. The proper functions of a legislature are confined to codifying such traditions as have been generally accepted.

Where, however, a tyrannical government wishes to override tradition and to legislate on the basis of its own theories for the achievement of some purpose unknown to, and not accepted by, the people, its stability will depend on the amount of military or police force at its command. Doctrinaire policies require the sanction of more force than the policies of a military invader. Ever since the revolution of 1689 the latter has been the method of government in vogue in England. Successive administrations have consistently forced upon the mass of the people policies adapted to the attainment of individualistic objectives quite alien to the nation. During the whole period subsequent to the accession of William of Orange the majority of the population has been compelled by the extension of penal legislation to maintain policies in conformity with official designs. The revolt has produced the swing of the electoral pendulum against every administration that has held office in the period. Electoral defeat of an administration, however, has never had any effect upon policy, and has merely changed the personnel of the tyrants in office. As the avowed or hidden purpose of government has never varied, policy could not change in principle. The party conflict has throughout been a mere game. There are slight differences of manner and phrase to be observed, slight variations in capacity to apply principle, but not the smallest deviation as to principle. Lloyd George was a little more socialistic than Lord Randolph Churchill, and Ramsay MacDonald a little more advanced than Lloyd George. Baldwin goes farther than Snowden could have gone before him; but Snowden, or whoever comes after, will go farther still. So long as the purpose remains the tendency must continue. No politician is honest who pretends that there is any difference between his policy and the policy of his opponents other than a slight variation in technique. No

change can come by voting; and even when a great Prime Minister, such as Disraeli, takes office he finds himself powerless to apply the principles for which he has been a lifelong advocate. It is not practical to attempt to propound or initiate policies until the purpose, and in consequence the tendency, is changed. To change the tendency there must be a change of heart and a return to the true purpose of national politics.

CHAPTER IV

THE SECRET OF POWER

POLITICS is a science before it becomes an art. As one of the exact sciences it consists in the study of the methods by which societies are formed, the dangers they have to guard against, the circumstances which make them healthy or invalid, and the comparative value of different ideas. When these matters have been ascertained by experience, principles can be logically deduced. The resulting knowledge is matter of objective fact, and is not subject to modification by criticism, or variation by opinion. The principles governing the construction and maintenance of the body politic are as fixed as the laws of mechanics, and are obtained in a similar manner. This is not always realized, because in mechanics the premises are few, recently acquired, and consciously known. In politics the premises are innumerable, while conscious science can cover only an inconsiderable portion of a statesman's knowledge, the greater part of which is wrapped up in instinct and tradition. To preserve this knowledge is the function of men with the power to reflect and remember.

The art of politics, or statecraft, consists of the tact, skill, and human address with which science is applied by men of action. Strength of will and reverence for tradition and authority are more important qualities in statecraft than any amount of intellectual brilliance. For, as the science is cultivated by learning, study, and thought, the art depends wholly upon character. The first depends on the power of wisdom, the second on the power of direction, and both are personal powers which can neither be bestowed by the king nor created by the franchise. Political power is derived from the union of these personal qualities, and in no way from physical force, which is merely an instrument of power. Power resides in " hands," not in whip or spur.

There is in human nature at its best a capacity to recognize the power of the man of pure motive and sound knowledge. The instinct of self-preservation leads to appreciation of the

statesman, or man of destiny, and to realization that personal and public interests are best served by loyalty and obedience to his commands. The man who can call forth this tribute is a leader. He is the expert in social affection, the engineer of society, whose devotion to race interests at any cost to himself or his reputation provides the cement of civilization.

The temperament of a leader is the result of the control of the instinct of self-preservation by masculine virtue and the social tradition. It arises from substitution, on account of greater efficiency, of the motive of national service for that of personal gain. This nobler and wiser attitude, being of later development than the primitive instincts, must be carefully fostered; for if the traditions which produce it are destroyed there must be a relapse into barbarism, and a recrudescence of the anti-social primitive instincts which run riot in the realms of modern industry.

Trade has familiarized the nation with the attitude that values every action according to the financial profit accruing therefrom. When the nation was dominated by traditions of military service these traditions spread into industry and moulded it. Now the opposite tendency is at work, and industrial ideals have spread even into military service and degraded it. The war produced the phenomenon of the able-bodied "ex-service man," who takes the stand that he has earned a reward (in addition to the "pay" which is a receipt for service) by performing the normal duty of serving his country. Considering the standards of the day it was inevitable that it should be forgotten that it is a primary duty to fight for the country, and if need be to die for it. The greatest service of all cannot be rewarded because he who fell has gone beyond rewards. There can be no principle on which a slighter service can be recognized. The living can have no greater reward than the praise and honour rendered to the dead. Great nations do not reward patriotic service: they recognize it by granting medals and honours and by such promotion as loads the patriot with greater duties and responsibilities. A patriot will look for his reward, and find it, in his heart. If he reck nothing of consequences to himself and devote all his energy to the service of his country he will surely find an adequate recompense in the glory of England and the destiny of the race. From patriotism springs the only permanent success a man can know—the serene and overflowing happiness of a healthy mind. Love of country

transcends all personal feelings, so that loss of reputation and the scorn of crowds, and even the loss of sons, can be borne in the swelling emotion breathed by Scott in his panegyric on "my own, my native land." Patriotism gives proportion and elegance to life and enables us to survive the ordeal of industrialism and the theories of prigs. It has saved England, again and again, in spite of her politicians and her daily Press. It makes flesh harder than steel and honour stronger than malice. It has even enabled us to sustain a view of England blacker than that depicted by John of Gaunt, and to stand by calmly till this other Eden, demi-paradise, shall be her true self again.

CHAPTER V

THE SECRET OF ORGANIZATION

BY the time that common motives have become strong enough to originate breed, men appreciate the value of specialization and the importance of co-ordinating the various functions of the body politic. This appreciation gives rise to politics, which, as a science, lays down the principles on which the body politic is organized, and, as an art, regulates the services of its various members. Every member must be related by service before it can be linked by law to the body politic. The status of every member, whether an individual, a group, or an institution, is determined by its function. Its privileges, its protection, and its sustenance are provided in return for the requisite services. No nation can afford to recognize the political status of individuals who perform no service, for these merely sap the nation's strength. Service is an essential ingredient of every institution and the only rational basis of status.

The component elements of organization are purposes, policies, and men. The purpose of business organization is to elaborate service, and the purpose of political organization is to guarantee the service and to maintain the links that unite members to the body politic. Thus such bodies as the Bar Council, the Law Society, and the General Medical Council are political organizations, because they are bodies which provide for the proper qualification of those engaged in the learned professions of law and medicine. They guarantee a high standard of service, and are able in return to secure privileges from the body politic and to safeguard the legal status of their members.

In the Middle Ages every profession, trade, craft, or mystery had its properly equipped political organization to attend to the chain which linked up the occupation with the nation, and to see that its particular function was performed efficiently for the service of the nation and not merely for private gain. Agriculture, industry, and the professions were all organized so that every individual citizen was a serving member of

some organization which guaranteed the efficiency of his service while it represented him politically and protected his economic interests. Private enterprise was allowed full play so long as it conformed to national politics; it was checked only where it might conflict with national interests. Thus political organization fostered the status of every individual, and from the services of all flowed the common welfare. The movement from status to contract resulted in the removal of the restraints on enterprise, and the essential relationship of individuals to the body politic was in most cases entirely destroyed. The nation suffered because the general rule for securing efficiency, that prevented anyone from practising any calling for profit until he had had seven years' apprenticeship, fell into desuetude; and the individual suffered because he was left unprotected from the competition of an overcrowded labour market. The trouble in industry to-day arises from the fact that those engaged in it have no special relationships with the body politic. The doctrine of individualism has reduced all citizens except professional men to a dead level in the eyes of the law. Trade has no political organization to protect it. Trade unions and masters' associations are not political societies, but piratical or privateering organizations designed to wage war upon each other. Business is organised not to serve, but to exploit, the body politic. Nor is such exploitation confined within the nation, for the piratical organizations of finance, as well as the trade unions, are largely controlled by alien influences. The international control of the trade unions is bad enough, but it is of small importance compared with the international control of finance. The available information with regard to alien control, though meagre, is yet sufficiently disquieting, and this control must be eradicated before any economic reform can be effectively undertaken. International decontrol of the industrial system is a necessary preliminary to the establishment of sound political organization. When proper political relationships are restored the effective consideration of economic questions, such as profits and wages, will become possible. Without such restoration, not governments, strikes, or Royal Commissions will avail to settle the economic issues involved.

The body politic is absolutely dependent on service for its upkeep, and it is futile to investigate economic questions until the political guarantees for the maintenance of service are

restored. It is impossible for a government to intervene in an economic dispute in an unregulated system of licensed freebooting. So long as each individual or collective interest is simply out for exploitation, the body politic must remain paralysed. Where the government can and should intervene is to forbid all trade except under regulations guaranteeing service. When the political status of trade is fixed, economic conditions can be dealt with in relation to policy. It is not only those troublesome societies, the trade unions, but the whole of industry, that must be taught that the interests of race are paramount, and the body politic is to be served and not exploited. The government has an easy task here, because it can always grant privileges and monopolies to those who accept its regulations. To intervene to guarantee services is the duty of wise government. Modern governments intervene in every direction except this!

CHAPTER VI

THE SECRET OF PROPERTY

(*a*) THE FEUDAL CONCEPTION OF PROPERTY

IF recourse is had to the legal textbooks that treat of the law of real property, a sufficient account of the law at any particular period can be obtained. But those authorities are concerned exclusively with the rights and obligations of individuals, and throw little or no light upon the purpose the law was intended to serve. They omit altogether to indicate that the whole original fabric of law has been destroyed and recast to suit the purposes of the individualistic revolution. In considering these omissions it must be borne in mind that lawyers are concerned exclusively with the interests of their individual clients, with the effect of the law in practice, and have no concern with legislation. They are constantly engaged in examination of personal rights and obligations, and must regard the law from the various eccentric standpoints of individuals. For this reason, though all specialists are liable to fail to reach a proper perspective for the practice of statecraft, the lawyer is particularly unfitted by the nature of his calling to make a sound legislator or administrator. He tends to take a diametrically opposite point of view to that of the statesman, who must look to the welfare of the body politic, which is something of more importance even than the total of all the individuals composing it. The nation is a trust from the past, handed down conditionally for posterity, and from the statesman's point of view, the race standpoint, the individual members, who change from day to day and year to year, are important only in so far as they contribute by their services to enrich the national heritage. The general welfare has been steadily improved by service rendered in bygone ages, and the inheritance must be handed on with increased advantages. To the lawyer the important aspect of property is its relation to the individual; to the statesman its important aspect is its use to the body politic.

Feudal statesmen thought more about the interests of the land, and how its steady development from generation to generation could be secured, than about the personal right and enjoyment of the people who owned and occupied it. It is apparent that if land is not properly drained, fenced, and cultivated; if woods are not properly thinned, felled, pruned, and replanted, no one will get any benefit. On the other hand, if proper cultivation is ensured, then the benefit accrues to the whole community, and not merely to the owner of the soil. Land without the addition of man's labour is a swamp, a jungle, or a desert. Before it can be cultivated it requires heavy capital expenditure.

Unless the owner has a permanent interest in land which can descend to his sons, or other ascertainable and selected persons, he will have no inducement to make a capital outlay or expend time and energy on which he can get no return in his own lifetime. He may not find it worth while to drain if his hold on his land is to be as precarious as his life. As to tree-planting, where there is no possibility of profit for half a century, or perhaps not for two centuries, no one would undertake it. As it is in the public interest that such permanent improvements to land should be made it is politic to provide an incentive. This can be done by applying the hereditary principle to landholding. Even Gladstone admitted that private ownership with legal descent was the only economical method of administration. He also admitted that private ownership was the cheapest method, and that government officials would involve at least two and a half times the expenditure, and that even then they would never have the motive or ability to cultivate effectively. There is sound reasoning behind the institution of private property, which goes back so far that it is traceable even to animals, but the Conservative, Radical, and Socialist Parties are alike bent on abolishing it.

As an instance of the bias of lawyers in the field of statecraft, it may be illuminating to quote the following passage from the latest and best of the textbooks on the law of property. Bearing in mind that the object of feudal laws was to secure the best agriculture and forestry, it is interesting to observe that Mr. Cheshire thinks: "To a lawyer feudalism means that the land of the country is not owned by the persons who to the outward eye appear to be owners, but is held by them from somebody else. It is the negation of

freedom. It implies subordination, it means that one man is deliberately made inferior to another. Now, when it is remembered that in pre-feudal days the land of Europe was owned absolutely, though subject to custom, by persons who were grouped together in village communities, it becomes a matter of interest to discover why it was that a great part of the world lapsed from a state of comparative freedom into one of servility, why land ownership disappeared and land tenure took its place. The change *undoubtedly represented a retrogression* in the history of the world, but it was one of the necessary consequences of the disruption of the Roman Empire by the barbarian invaders." [1]

There is absolutely no warrant for such an opinion. If we take into account the object of private property we shall be forced to the conclusion that feudalism attained that object better than any system that preceded it, and, at any rate in its English form, it produced better physique, higher culture, art, and religion than anything that has followed it. Though in early times the Roman law had decentralized government by means of the *patria potestas*, the head of the family exercising sway over the family group, as the English lord of the manor kept his peace in his own domain, yet it developed a highly individualistic conception of property. The Roman conception of property and individual liberty was fundamentally different from the English. Roman law abounds with provisions which secure the personal enjoyment of land by the owner. English law has none. There is nothing, for instance, in English law that corresponds to the *jus spatiandi*, the right to wander at large over land. An Englishman's rights are the results and not the objects of the law's regard. A man may pitch a tent on common land, not because he has any right to do so, for the law recognizes none, but on common land no one can stop him, and while he is in personal occupation no one can disturb him. The Roman law made enjoyment an object in itself, the English law produced enjoyment as a result, a by-product of ownership. While the Roman law gave direct protection to individual rights, the English law was more logical. A right being the passive aspect of a relationship of which duty is the active principle, the English lawgiver was content to insist on the performance of services, leaving the rights to take care of themselves. Scottish lawyers are wont to talk of the superior logic of Roman law.

[1] "Modern Real Property."

If they mean that it is more consistent with individualism they are correct.

After the fall of the Roman Empire the system of land ownership to a large extent reverted to a primitive form of communal ownership, which invariably resulted in bad cultivation. House property was still private. For we are told by Tacitus [1] that our forefathers, who " came from lands where the Roman Eagle had never been seen " [2] were freemen. Each held his house and curtilage as his own absolute property, and it is from this ancient stock that we derive the sanctity of the English home and the idea that an Englishman's house is his castle. The feudal system of land tenure was not concerned to interfere with that.

The regal wisdom that devised the feudal system was concerned to maintain both the institutions of the family and private property. The older systems decentralized through the family, hence the sanctity attaching to the home and the private peace maintained by a freeman in his curtilage.

The great step forward in civilization produced by feudalism was due to a new idea, that of decentralizing government through the administration first of land and then of industry by attaching responsibility to private property. The life-work of Maitland was tending towards the unfolding of this idea, which, owing to his untimely death, was never completely stated. What we have to realize is the significance of the evidence he produced and the illuminating brilliance of what he actually said and no one else has ever noticed.

The *patria potestas* was such an absolute delegation of sovereign power that it originally included criminal jurisdiction ; and its counterpart among the more northerly races, who were influenced by Rome, carried with it such jurisdiction where the freeman kept his peace in his house and immediately around it. The creation of the manor was devised for the improvement of agriculture and civil administration. Its essence lay in substituting tenure for ownership of property. Ownership means that a man has a free and exclusive enjoyment, the right to use, alter, and destroy, and the right to sell or dispose of a thing by will. This is the primitive conception of private property, the individualist view of the barbarian, the view of the modern Whig, whose philosopher Locke defines it as " Property, whose original is from the right a man

[1] Germania, C. 16. [2] Freeman.

has to use any of the inferior creatures for his subsistence and comfort, is for the sole advantage of the proprietor, so that he may even destroy the thing that he has property in." Thus property as the subject of absolute private ownership might be rendered useless at the caprice of the possessor, or land might be in the hands of persons with no knowledge of its administration. As the life of the race depends on proper administration, the primitive races protect themselves by giving every one an equal right to cultivate. This ends in such waste as necessitates constant migrations. The feudal system remedies this by restoring individual interests and at the same time making the individual responsible. When the status of the owner is once fixed, and his relationship to the body politic secured by services, there is an object in protecting him. Sir Hall Caine recently naïvely told of what he apparently considered an original discovery. He said: " In certain Eastern countries there was a law that if a landowner neglected to till his land for one year, he was warned by the ruling authority. If he did the same a second year, he was warned again. If he did it a third year, he was bundled out and his land was worked by somebody else. The meaning of this old law was plain enough. It meant that the nominal owner of the land was charged with the duty of cultivating it for his own good and the good of the community. If he failed to do that, then out he had to go." Sir Hall Caine need not have looked so far afield to find a principle which was at the root of our own legal system.

After the Norman Conquest the position was reconsidered in the light of experience of English and continental feudalism, and reforms were introduced to strengthen the system. These reforms were not concerned with making one man " inferior " to another—a phrase reminiscent of the fallacies of equality and fraternity on which the French, American, and other revolutions have been based—for that has been achieved, whether deliberately or not, by an agent that is certainly not human. They were concerned with securing good administration of land or real property. The familiar explanation of the expression *real property* as given in the legal textbooks is that it was derived from the real action, in which the plaintiff sued for the thing itself, the *thing* being, by derivation from the Latin *res*, real or realty. A more significant explanation is that the word " real " is synonymous with " royal," and all land being owned by the king, and held of him by private

persons, was royal property. House property became included in realty and subject to tenure, not because there was any direct intention to lessen the importance of the family as a unit, but for the reason that the land being subject to conditions of service and forfeiture for failure of service the house would fall vacant with the land, and come within the principle *quidquid plantatur solo, solo cedit.*

The result was that a man could hold land so long, and only so long, as proper services were rendered. The test of good agriculture was the capacity of the holder to make the land support and equip its quota of armed men for national defence. Thus was the country protected in case of attack, and the king exercised a personal sway over the essential requirements of race life. By the feudal, that is to say, the hereditary, nature of tenure the whole force of natural instinct was enlisted to provide an incentive for the improvement of the land. As land could not be disposed of by will, so as to oust the family, continuity of breeds was secured. Feudalism was in design, and in fact, the wisest and most elaborate system for the maintenance of race purity ever devised by man.

(*b*) REGULATION OF SERVICES

Feudalism was not a system, but a political philosophy based on the principle of service to the body politic. It was the inspiration of the Middle Ages. The race must always depend principally on agriculture and wholly upon the development of land. Feudalism originated at a period when it depended solely and directly upon agriculture. The principles of service were elaborated under the influence of military discipline, and applied first to agriculture and land administration, and, when commerce attained importance, to industry and trade. Land and agriculture were controlled through landlords, from whom services were exacted. While the landlords were bound by oath of fealty to the king, their servants were similarly bound to them. A personal nexus sanctified every political relationship. The crafts were controlled through gilds or companies, which were responsible for quality and standards and maintained prices so that there could be no unfair competition, undercutting, or sweating. Thus was the sovereign authority delegated to responsible tenants and corporations, and control was exercised over every individual and every activity in the interests of the race.

This control was exercised without the expensive intervention of an official bureau and all the irritation, waste, and incompetence which are the invariable and inevitable accompaniments of a public civil service. Authority was humanized by personal relationships and responsibilities, and the system was cemented with social affection created by mutual dependence. The incentive to labour, which has almost disappeared in the twentieth century, was supplied by the security of tenure assured to all who carried out their duties, and by hereditary interests and privileges which preserve character. While the regulations were more complete than the modern socialist ever dreamed of, the system maintained individual interests and freedom to an extent that individualism can never hope for. If the purpose of politics is the maintenance of race interests it must be politic to guarantee all essential services and to prevent all disservice. On this hypothesis regulation by law is a necessity.

The only political basis of private property is its efficiency in supplying the required services. Failure of service should, therefore, be followed by forfeiture. Forfeiture should not be regarded as punishment or be based on any moral ground, or any regard for individual interests. It should be introduced to maintain the proper exercise of a function, so that where any owner fails a new grant may be made to one who may succeed. Each function should be under the supervision of experts representing the whole of the persons engaged in each particular occupation, this being the only rational basis of representative government. Tests of good service could easily be devised and applied. The principle could be applied to every trade, as it has always been applied to the learned professions whose members risk losing their whole means of livelihood for such trivial breaches of discipline as having their photographs printed in newspapers.

Forfeiture is distinct from confiscation, for in the former case there is the principle of sanctioning service, while in the latter there is no principle, and its incidence falls probably more heavily on the man who has performed a service than on one who has not. Death duties and the income tax are instances of confiscation. It is bad policy to confiscate, and perhaps by so doing to cripple a well-administered estate, and strange justice at the same time to leave untaxed the estate that is so badly administered that it produces no income. If legal training produced capacity for statecraft the judges, or

at any rate those judges who sit in Parliament, would have made some effective protest against the extension of confiscation as now sanctioned by law. Such an unprincipled policy must sooner or later prove fatal to national credit and character. Forfeiture on the other hand, is on a sound basis of principle, and should be applied, of course without compensation, wherever industry breaks down through failure in the control.

(c) SUCCESS OF THE ENGLISH SYSTEM

The English conception of property was that of a royal asset required for race service. The king could not administer all property personally, and so he left it in private possession, and, in leaving it, left also a residue of his sovereignty. The owner was the king's deputy, liable to be deprived of his estates and privileges if he failed in his services. The genius of the race was displayed in its fidelity to the trust reposed in it. The whole kingdom was the king's property, and local government was carried out with all the advantages of humanity and personal touch arising from the intimate relationships engendered by the system, and the royal dignity conferred on every class. The king, through his deputies, the whole body of property-owners, kept a constant overriding personal control. Every field was tilled, every child educated, and every trade carried on under the stimulus of private enterprise and hereditary and transmissible interests. The rights and enjoyment of individuals flowed plentifully from the system, but were not objects of the law's concern. The law aimed only at securing a constant supply of food and other necessaries for the nation, and at providing a territorial force to protect it from invasion. The concerns of the race being adequately cared for, the interests of individuals took good care of themselves.

The success of the system was amply demonstrated by the condition of the people. Englishmen had in the fifteenth century attained a greater measure of freedom and wealth than the inhabitants of any other European country. It was in the maintenance of social affection that feudalism scored its greatest triumph. Though the horizontal division of classes was its most prominent feature, a no less important characteristic of the English system was the perpendicular division involved in the relationship between overlords and

vassals. This relationship required the lord to protect his man, and the man to assist his lord. An injury to the man was an insult to his lord, and the social ties thus created transcended class solidarity and mitigated its exclusiveness. Out of the practical necessity for caring for supporters in order to increase the value of their support, there grew up among the feudal lords a habit of consideration and affection for their own people. Of this generous tradition Toryism became sole heir. After the revolution of 1689 the nobility were, in the main, Whig, the gentry predominantly Tory. The attentions of the Whigs were monopolized in giving satisfaction to their supporters in the towns, while the duties of office drew many of them from their estates to London. The Tory gentry were left in almost undisputed possession of the country, where among the lingering incidents of feudalism they kept alive customs which depended entirely upon the personal element for their usefulness. So it came about in the eighteenth century that the Whig oligarchy, supported by the burgesses of the towns, was opposed by a country party composed of an aristocratic hierarchy of squire, parson, yeoman, craftsman, and husbandman, each with his functions clearly defined and the whole welded together by a communal duty and mutual dependence. It is to this traditional generosity inherited from feudalism, and to what Nietzsche called "the impulse generated by the superabundance of power" urging the nobleman to give, that the reforming activities of the Young England Party and the nineteenth-century Tories can be traced. Toryism, which is the typical English national spirit, might well be summed up in Emile Faguet's maxim, "*un peuple sain est celui ou l'aristocratie est demophile et ou le peuple est aristocrate.*" Concern for dependants is its inseparable attribute, and the patriotic desire to increase the power and efficiency of the race its motive.

(*d*) THE REVOLT AGAINST REGULATIONS

The predominant standards of taste at the present day are those of the traders, and it is characteristic of the orthodox "shop-window" temperament to judge every institution by its superficial features. Modern politicians have excited indignation against feudalism by holding up the manners and forms of a turbulent age to the ridicule of those who live under the regulations of industrialism. It is customary for these

critics to expatiate on the irksome incidents of frankpledge and the manor courts, and to enlarge in eloquent terms on the tyrannical activities of the Orders of Knighthood. Nor have the critics of feudalism hesitated to invent evidence they could not find, by talking of the prevalence of the *jus primæ noctis*,[1] a custom which was very rare on the Continent and was never introduced into this country at all. It is ever the form and not the spirit that the modern critic selects for attack. No one in his senses would suggest that there should be a revival of feudal forms, or a return to the cast-iron precedence or the rough-and-ready justice of the Middle Ages. What ill-bred people overlook is that the underlying spirit of feudalism fostered the character and traditions of the race, and produced the temperament that prized the performance of duties and a high standard of work above their incidental rewards.

It was certainly not on account of any superficial failings that opposition to feudalism developed. Indeed, that opposition was not called forth by any failings, but by the success of the system in maintaining service to the body politic as the cardinal principle of administration. Order is created by harnessing the instincts with traditions, whose fibre is memory. If the memory snaps, primitive instincts break away into the anarchy of individualism. Instinct will break its harness if it can, and the maintenance of order is dependent on the superior strength of the will to control it, and to direct its terrific force. Individualism is the natural result of the decay of memory; it is a relapse, a reversion to barbarism.

No sooner had the tradition of service become well established than the pressure of instinct was felt. Possessors of land who held as tenants for the most part appreciated tradition and desired to co-operate in a system which worked so well. By the very fact that enjoyment was not the object of the system, a fuller measure of enjoyment was actually experienced than in the systems which pursued pleasure for the sake of the individual. The accomplishment of results by indirect methods is peculiarly English, and continental

[1] The *jus primæ noctis* was part of the *droit du Seigneur*, or the Law of God. The Council of Carthage, in A.D. 398, enjoined chastity during the first night of matrimony, the bride being the bride of God. The best psychologists at the present day might well approve of this regulation. We need not speculate as to the possibly interested motives of the priesthood, as abuses, if there were any, were confined to the Continent.

jurists have invariably been struck with the success of English law in preserving liberty without ever referring to it. It has often been remarked, as an example, that there is no law guaranteeing the freedom of the Press in England, as in other countries, and yet in England alone is the Press really free. So it was with property. The tenant was not theoretically an owner, but a mere tenant during good behaviour, but as a man of tradition actually had absolute security of tenure for ever. He had no rights of enjoyment, but only duties to serve and privileges to enable him to do so, but in fact nowhere else was there so much enjoyment or so much to enjoy. In the words of Bolingbroke, "They indulge in pleasure; but as their industry is not employed about trifles, so their amusements are not made the business of their lives." The man of tradition knows that as soon as amusement is made the business of life, amusement ceases, for it is necessary to have the wherewithal to be amused. When traditions decay the individual breaks out under the influence of a passionate desire to use all the accumulations of wealth in pleasure. He forgets that the accumulation is the result of service, and sees only that service is irksome and here and now is the opportunity to spend. Then the law is put to a test and the harness of individualism is called upon to withstand a strain. The individual who wished to evade services employed the lawyer to find a flaw in the law or to invent a fiction which would serve his end. The lawyer who was not concerned with the object of the settlement of land designed to ensure the economic protection of particular breeds, soon discovered means to make land marketable until finally Parliament recognized the aspirations of individualism and statutes were enacted on principles similar to those of Roman law. Statute law is the result of centuries of conflict between statesmen who were striving to preserve established traditions and lawyers who were trying to find loopholes in the law to enable policies of individualism to prevail. The earlier statutes, up to and including the Statute of Uses of 1534, by insisting on the services due to the king, aimed at restoring the fabric which the lawyers were breaking down. Then came the sharp political conflict between tradition and individualism, which came to a head in the Tudor period and ended in the overthrow of tradition with the defeat of Charles I. This was followed by an ineffective attempt at compromise at the Restoration and the complete submergence of national ideals

at the Revolution. The rising tide of industrialism produced almost frantic impatience with any kind of restriction, and in the nineteenth century a series of Acts, culminating in the new property laws of 1925, abolished even the pretence that ownership carries with it any duties or responsibilities towards the body politic.

Thus was the system of services, so elaborately worked out by the Conqueror and his successors down to Edward I, finally destroyed, and the system of composition for services, or direct taxation, set up in its place, with the results that are to be seen to-day. The change was brought about by a tendency which was not confined to England. England was peculiar in her resistance to it and in her attempt even to expel the individualists, some of whom, at any rate, were driven to found colonies to their liking in America. In other countries the acceptance of Roman law at the time of the Renaissance effected a rapid change from the traditions of feudalism to the chaos of individualism. In England the influence of the Roman system was felt, and felt severely, but, according to Maitland, it was never a dominating factor in our politics or law. The codified civil law naturally appealed to the learned, for its arrangement and accessibility had an advantage over our own unwritten law supplemented by badly drafted and inconsistent statutes. For some time the intellectual fashion of Rome was in vogue. When Blackstone lectured at Oxford in the eighteenth century he found this fashion so overpowering that he was constrained to adopt the Roman arrangement to enable him to make a commentary on the English law. From an English standpoint it is artificial and egregious to adopt the classification of " rights " of persons, things and actions. It is certainly not convenient, and has been abandoned ; but the fact that it could ever have been adopted by the most learned lawyer of his day is significant of the overwhelming triumph of individualism and the industrial spirit.

(*e*) THE RESULT OF THE REVOLT

It is to the reign of Henry VIII that the beginnings of the tendencies which have now come to a head in a counter-movement against industrialism are to be traced. Ludovici has, in the " Defence of Aristocracy," traced the course of the struggle, and has shown how Edward VI, Elizabeth,

James I, and Charles I all strove to control the forces of unregulated competition. The struggle ended in compromise and disaster, till the national spirit, quelled at home, led to an impulsive development of Imperialism. *Laissez-faire* became the keynote of national politics as regards trade and property, and for three centuries the law has been steadily remodelled to safeguard the irresponsible interests of the owners and exploiters of wealth. The maintenance of standards of quality and living have been altogether discountenanced, and race interests have been totally ignored, while the right of the individual to make a profit in any way he pleases has been the sole aim of policy. In pursuance of this policy the increase of the population has been deliberately fostered by the encouragement of immigration. The " labour market " has been flooded and the British workman subjected to the competition of degraded types in order to reduce wages, while the surplus population thus utilized has been supported by the Poor Law and charity. The maintenance of large bodies of unemployed persons has been necessary to enable exploitation to proceed unchecked, and this maintenance has become a permanent charge on the landed interests and productive industry. By this means there is always a reserve of labour for the use of employers during trade booms, which is not retained as an overhead charge in slumps, while wages have been reduced to the level for which the alien will consent to work. The feudal system had known nothing of wages in the modern sense. Every craftsman, labourer, and apprentice was supplied with necessaries, whatever the market price, and the " wages " we read of were a cash payment over and above a subsistence allowance, like soldiers' " pay." When the modern wage became general there was no guarantee that it would keep up to the level of a bare subsistence allowance. In fact, wages generally sank far below this level, until, in 1912, the wages paid to the whole wage-earning population fell far short of the amount necessary to provide that population with the bare necessaries of existence.[1] The balance is made up by private charity and State grants out of taxes. The Tudors made appeals to private charity as a last resort before instituting the Poor Law, which has become an essential adjunct of the industrial system. Charity has been so organized and developed, as a means of exploiting religion, to make up the deficiencies in wages that there were in London

[1] See p. 111, *infra*.

alone immediately prior to the Great War nine hundred charities distributing food and clothing, and since that date the number of these charities has been increased. The operation of the Poor Law has been greatly extended, while the principle of State aid now applies not only to the aged who are worn out in the service of industry, but even to the supply of a steadily increasing proportion of the necessaries of life to wage-earners and their dependants. The "State" gives the employer the advantage of free education on strictly middle-class, and never on working-class, lines, so that the worker may be amenable to industrial regulations, and, at the same time, secures the wage-earners against unemployment. Thus the community is living under a system by which the landowners, and the professional and middle classes and the wage-earners themselves, are heavily taxed in addition to the proper burdens which each should bear. These taxes enable about three per cent of the population to indulge in exploitation of the rest. The moneyed interests for whose benefit this taxation is levied are themselves able to avoid the burden of taxation, and even by the medium of life insurance business to reap a rich harvest out of income-tax and death duties.

While this is the economic condition to which industrialism has reduced the mass of the people more remains to be said with regard to agriculture. Long before the Settled Land Acts reversed the beneficial policy of entail the effect of bringing land freely into the market was observable in the neglect of drainage. This became so general that, in the middle of last century, Parliament was actually driven to subsidize landlords to enable them to restore the drainage, a matter which could never have been neglected under the old system. The canals have been stopped in the interests of one particular group, regardless of the fact that cheap transport was essential to both producers and consumers of agricultural produce.

It is not as if the hatred of regulation had led to any real condition of *laissez-faire*. Far from it; we are interfered with in every direction and in the most intimate concerns of daily life. While formerly there was a control sufficient to ensure the performance of services, there is now a control to compel every citizen to swell the profits of the exploiter. While he is taxed to run trams at a loss to benefit, not the wage-earner, but the wage-payer, he is forced to live on tinned

or unwholesome food for the benefit of the millionaire. As a race we have lost everything that Englishmen used to prize. The wage-earners are forced to see their children sent to school too young, to be taught in a manner that is wholly evil and unfits them for their class. They may select neither their food nor drink, while drink of good quality is unobtainable at any price. They may not decide for themselves the time of day when they may have a glass of beer. They must spend an increasing proportion of their earnings in the manner laid down by statute, and they are regimented, inspected, and documented as if they were Germans. In their work they are irritated by regulations of a useless, ignorant, and wasteful description. Is it to be wondered at that we live in an age of industrial storm ?

Such conditions would be unendurable even with the most responsible management. But to add to the impetus they give towards chaos the limited liability system has eliminated responsible personal relationships. The system ousts men of the type which is endowed with social affection. The wage-earner has no employers to protect him, no one with whom he is in personal human contact. He works for a legal fiction—a company with no real existence. It is this cardinal fact that the reformer forgets when he thinks to cure labour unrest with illusory profit-sharing schemes. Apart from the essential economic unsoundness of such schemes they do not touch the real causes of discontent, which are rarely economic and generally due to the absence of all personal touch. Those who think of profit-sharing as a remedy forget that it is among the best, and not the worst, paid workers that labour unrest is invariably most acute. They forget that these same malcontents who cannot be bribed with high wages went cheerily not so many years ago to face death under good leadership. They ask for the protection of men, and they get companies ; they wish to buy beer with their wages and they get, at an outrageous price, a tasteless, worthless wash.

Writers on feudalism confess to a difficulty in defining the system and in tracing its origin, development, and decay. This is because feudalism was not a system, but a pervading idea of service, rising to the height of an inspiring ideal. The offspring of martial ardour, it could not contemplate the "rights" of man or know anything of such a fiction as "equality." It tolerated no groanings of those who claim the right to work or the right to live, but enjoined on all the

duty to work, or, if need be, to die. It had no room for idlers, rich or poor, but where wealth existed it entailed the greater service. If our institutions are examined they will be found to have been consistent in so far as the aim of service was faithfully pursued. The inconsistencies sprang from the harnessed influence of the individualist's instinct for gain. In latter days our policies have been almost consistently individualistic, and the inconsistencies have arisen from such of the submerged traditions as still survive. The transference from the one point of view to the other has been completed, and we have arrived at the threshold of a new age, in which only a return to our best traditions can possibly save us. The submerged traditions have hitherto served us in wars and strikes, and have saved us from the worst consequences of individualism. They cannot go on doing so in a state of submergence, and must be revived. The revival does not imply the recrudescence of the forms of feudalism which were ephemeral, but the restoration of the spirit of service and of those unseen things which are eternal.

CHAPTER VII

THE SECRET OF ECONOMICS

STATECRAFT starts with the object of securing the progress of the race, whose ultimate goal is the concern of religion, mysticism, or philosophy. The statesman is not concerned to propound a faith, and his attitude towards religion must be confined to tolerance of such as is not subversive of order or breed or destructive of health. Further than this he is not concerned to interfere, though it is probable that successful statecraft will result in the unanimous adoption of a religion in tune with the aspirations of a united people. Chaos in religion appears to be a symptom of chaotic politics. Incidentally, then, statecraft may affect religion, but it is primarily concerned with the element, not of faith, but of hope. Its object is to maintain the nation in such conditions of health, prosperity, and safety as may give it hope for its future welfare. This object is attained by selection of breed and by making provision for the production and proper distribution of the materials required for the upkeep and defence of the body politic.

The science of economics lays down principles for the performance of those services which it is the province of political organization to control and guarantee. It is the branch of statecraft which deals with the administration of national resources. These resources consist "not alone of material wealth; we have a more precious treasure, the character of the people."[1] They consist, that is to say, of material possessions, capacity to produce and trade with other nations, knowledge and craftsmanship, honesty and energy, and also of the artificial conditions created by the character of the people. There are no economic laws save those which govern action, no economic conditions save those which have been deliberately or rashly created. These conditions are controllable, and the fact that they ever get beyond control is due to faults of statecraft. Economics is a science only in so far as it is concerned with investigating the policies which

[1] Disraeli.

foster the character of the people and the purposes and effects of artificial conditions, which can be made and modified at will.

Any science that is pursued without a purpose must be futile or dangerous and intolerable to the statesman. The scientific investigation of conditions is governed by purpose, for a condition cannot be good or bad or have any valuation at all except by relation to such a purpose. No doubt in all sciences the pursuit of original inquiries leads to different theories and differences of opinion which eventually become rectified and harmonized because the investigators are united in the pursuit of truth. The study of economics, however, has been carried on by different schools of thought which have arrived at widely different and totally irreconcilable conclusions. This is due to the fact that these schools have based their philosophies on fundamentally different premises with widely divergent purposes. One school of political economy has followed the lines laid down by Adam Smith, Jeremy Bentham, and John Stuart Mill, the apostles of individualism; another has followed Karl Marx and the modern socialists. Both are, from the point of view of statecraft, equally eccentric. A very few, notably Ruskin and Cunningham, have adopted an impartial race point of view and have attempted to arrive at conclusions unbiased by any doctrine.

The function of economics is to propound the principles on which administration should proceed, and these can be clearly discerned from the standpoint of race interests. From this point of view far more is taken into account than the orthodox authorities on political economy have ever seen. Theories have been elaborated in the attempt to justify the overthrow of tradition and to contradict the lessons of experience. The statesman must reject them all, for private ownership, with all its essential ingredients, particularly the control that links the owner to the body politic, has been evolved as the best method of ensuring services, of providing an incentive, of stimulating production, and of protecting the wealth produced. This method is traditional and no other can be compared with it.

For the purpose of administration, property which is the subject of private ownership must be divided into two classes. It was in the days when agriculture was the only industry that the law recognized these classes as consisting of land and

movable chattels, and defined them as real and personal property respectively. The old division was based upon the distinction between indestructible property which has to be administered for the race and the personal tools, dress, and furniture which have such an intimate relationship to the owner as to form part of his personality, like his horse, which lends him legs, and his dog which lends him eyes, ears, and teeth for defence. The development of other industries besides agriculture has not altered the fact that productive property consists almost exclusively of land, though factories and machinery attached to it have added to the scope of its productive possibilities.

The distinction between productive property on the one hand and consumable and personal property on the other is still fundamental, and the fact that the distinction is no longer recognized by law is a fault of the law, but in no way lessens its political importance. Policy with regard to permanent property which requires to be administered in order to produce consumable and perishable property necessarily differs from the policy to be applied to the consumable property which only exists to be destroyed. The administration of the former is concerned with the production of the latter; the administration of the latter is concerned merely with its distribution for consumption. The laws of all European nations, except Hungary, now ignore the distinction, and treat productive property as though it were of the same nature as perishable property. Land changes hands as readily as a ton of coal, regardless of the capacity or intention of the purchaser to administer it. Administration is left to the caprice of irresponsible owners, who decide at will whether they will cultivate it, use it for enjoyment, whether they will build on it or undermine it. The result is to make Europe dependent on the Americas for its food supply. The object of the special pleading of most political economists is to prove that this state of affairs is desirable. The object of economics, as a genuine science, is to propound the principles which will foster the character best fitted to administer productive property, and capable of maintaining sound economic conditions.

Productive property is not the same thing as "capital," which is a highly artificial conception of the theoretical economists. Capital includes money, but productive property is not money, nor is it even dependent upon money. Money

can produce nothing, though Shylock said he could make it breed. Money is a token, a measure of value, a medium of exchange, a sign manual of the royal authority to command services. Its possession carries the power to acquire property.

There is one, and only one, sound basis for the issue of money by the sovereign power, and that is the acknowledgment of services rendered to the body politic. The statesman should confine his view of money to its character as a receipt for service. An individual who has rendered a service to the body politic by fighting for the country or producing wealth may receive in return money as a measure of the value of the service rendered. As this receipt carries with it power to command, it can be exchanged for property, goods, or services. But the original issue of the money should be in respect of service *to the nation only*. The value of the money depends entirely on the service it represents and the accuracy of the estimation of such service for the purpose of issue. It is not affected by any other standard whatever. Far from being affected by the gold standard,[1] this principle affects the value of gold. Gold fluctuates in money value: so does corn and wages. Gold has an artificial and variable value. The only constant and invariable standard of value is service. So long as money is issued as a receipt for direct services it represents wealth and can create no economic difficulties or embarrassing complications. The more such money accumulates the better. Economic troubles and complications with regard to exchange begin when money is issued that is not a receipt for public services, a practice that arises in various ways abhorrent to statecraft. The issue of every piece of money that is not a receipt for direct service to the body politic must result in giving power to command services to persons who have not rendered any, and must also have the effect of reducing the value of all money issued. Both results are injurious to those who render genuine services, and the application of false principles to the issue of money involves a tax on productive industry, including, of course, all who draw a living in wages, salaries, or fees.

Money begins to accumulate in private hands when, as a result of successful enterprise, a producer finds himself in possession of more than he requires for the purchase of all he wishes to consume. The surplus may be hoarded, invested,

[1] With regard to the Gold Standard, see p. 134, *infra*.

or lent. Occasionally this surplus will be hoarded as a reserve for the future. Usually, however, it is invested in the expectation of making a profit or lent to a bank or some other body for a fixed rate of interest. Investment in the purchase of more property of the same nature as the investor already possesses will result in an extension of his activities as a producer. It is a good thing when a successful farmer invests his accumulated profits in purchasing an adjacent farm from an unsuccessful neighbour, for this results in an extension of the area of good administration and is beneficial to the whole community. It is a responsible investment under personal control. If, however, the investor does not wish to increase his responsibilities, or wishes to get rid of them by selling out and investing in some concern over which he has no control, the case is different, and from a political, as distinct from a purely legal, point of view such an irresponsible investment, which carries the rights but not the burdens of ownership, is based on the same principles as loan. In this sense lending money has become the universal practice of all who have money which they do not immediately require.

All money put into a bank is lent, and all money invested in limited liability companies is lent, just as much as money invested in government securities. The practice of lending money, once universally condemned, is now universally adopted, even people so poor as to have no more than thirty-one sixpences being officially adjured to lend it. The universal practice of lending money results in the concentration of the power to control wealth and industry in the hands of individuals and corporations which *deal in money*, and this is the primary cause of the economic collapse of all modern States. Take, for instance, the business of banking,[1] which consists of borrowing and lending money. The banks pay their customers so much interest on money deposited with them, and lend it at a higher rate of interest to business men. They perform other functions connected with exchange on which they make a considerable profit without responsibility or risk. The main business consists of lending borrowed money. The average rate of interest paid to the depositor is one and a half per cent per annum. The average rate charged for loans never falls below five per cent per annum, and is generally very much higher, amounting to one per cent over bank rate,

[1] For what banking once was and ought to be, see p. 137, *infra*.

and any period less than a month being charged to the borrower as a full month. Thus the banker, in return for his work in negotiating loans with full security and no risk of loss, makes a minimum profit of three and a half per cent on *customers' money*, and this profit is in most cases greatly exceeded. The proprietory insurance companies also make tremendous profits dealing in other people's money. Investment leads to further accumulations of profit in the hands of people who have done nothing to earn it, beyond making what are in fact loans of surplus money. These methods lead to an ever-increasing accumulation of spending power in the hands of those whom Lord Milner has described as the "moneyed interests." These people lack the capacity and the motive to exercise the creative function, the only function which can justify the legal protection of wealth. Such a statement does not necessarily imply that the system should be changed. It means that the personnel should be changed and that the moneyed interest should be identified with or made to serve the interests of productive industry, instead of exploiting and ruining them.

The secret of economic success lies in applying the principle of securing the capacity and protecting the character of productive industry. The problem is to emancipate productive industry from the control of the irresponsible moneyed interests which are hostile to it. For "just as productive industry welcomes rising prices, the moneyed interests must always be in favour of falling prices—because they render its own wares—money—more valuable."[1] The moneyed interests, which Lord Milner regarded as necessarily and invariably unpatriotic, have used their accumulations to control distribution and markets, reducing the price paid to the producer and artificially raising the cost to the consumer. The result was that just before the general strike in 1926 the average results were represented by a cauliflower being sold for tenpence at King's Cross for which the producer about five miles away had been paid one-third of a penny the previous day, and the consumer was paying over fifty shillings for a ton of coal which fetched only twenty shillings at the pit-head. It is not the small middleman or retailer who is making the enormous profits, but the controllers of finance, who number less than three per cent of the nation and perform no services

[1] Lord Milner. Posthumous papers published in "The Times," July 27, 29. 1925,

whatever. This small section of exploiters was in 1912 drawing thirty-five per cent of the national income, and must now be getting more than half. They make an income whatever the conditions of industry, and whether capital or labour is adequately remunerated or not.

Those who fail to see how the true principles of economics can be practically applied should study the way in which the problem was successfully tackled in Ireland by Plunkett and Russell from 1880 to 1914. The plan of the Irish Agricultural Organization Society was to emancipate the farmers from the gombeen man by putting the farmers in control of the markets. The policy was entirely successful. It encouraged the producers by getting proper prices and deprived the trader of his control of prices, a control which had been as hurtful to consumers as to producers. There was, of course, a tremendous outcry among the traders. They said that the movement was ruining civilization. The "danger of a debtless community" struck them with horror, and the fact that a farmer got more for his produce while the consumer paid less was the more disconcerting when it was discovered that the traders performed no service that could not be dispensed with. The producers displayed an ability in organizing distribution which upset all calculations. A resolution was passed by the Athlone Branch of the Irish Merchants' and Traders' Association on June 26, 1912, and forwarded to Mr. Birrell, "Calling on the Chief Secretary for Ireland to use his influence against the making of any grant from Treasury funds to the Irish Agricultural Organization Society or any kindred body that might directly or indirectly be applied to the detriment of the traders in the country, and further asking him to stamp out this endeavour to ruin the interests of traders." There was the principle locally applied and the effect of its application demonstrated. Method cannot be exactly duplicated, but a statesman worth his salt can apply the same principle anywhere and in any circumstances. The fact that debt has become "a national habit has made credit the ruling power, not the exceptional auxiliary of all transactions," [1] has placed the control in the power of the exploiters. That control is exercised over the whole of productive industry, and the economic position of both capital and labour in the coal industry and every other industry must get steadily worse until this control is utterly destroyed. It will, however,

[1] Disraeli.

never be destroyed so long as there is a vogue for Royal Commissions composed of the worst elements of the trouble, and so long as no effort is made by the sovereign power to protect vital economic interests.

PART III

ENGLISH TENDENCIES

TO ENGLAND

In writing of Thee, Sacred Mother of Men,
I would that an Angel were holding my pen,
That out of the darkness the things Thou hast lost
Might come to prevent all Thy breeds getting crossed.

From Harold the Saxon, and William of Gaul,
I'd conjure the secrets that time has let fall,
The secrets of service Plantagenet told,
That flow in the blood that never grows old.

Like fair Aphrodite, at God's stern decree
Thy proud soul sprang arm'd from the foam of the sea.
The Vikings from Norway and soldiers from Rome
Gave all that they had to adorn thee, their home.

The Pagan from Iceland, whose cobles set sail,
To ravish Thy coasts in the teeth of the gale,
Has brought Thee the wisdom of men who can rule
In spite of the whine of the Christian fool.

And now, on the threshold of some brighter Age
When aliens and pressmen shall pass from the stage,
The Hope of Thy future may set Thy soul Free,
And Sons of Thy Womb shall do homage to Thee.

CHAPTER I

NATIONALISM

THE British Isles are more fertile and temperate than any other land in the same latitude, and are surrounded by dangerous and inhospitable seas. Their coasts are for the most part inaccessible and easy to defend. While the fertility of the soil and the mild climate made these islands the coveted prize of every race, only the greatest soldiers and seamen could set out to invade them with any hope of effecting a conquest. Intending invaders would come

into conflict with others in pursuit of the same adventure, and, in addition, there were formidable natural obstacles to be overcome, while any landing was certain to be opposed by defending forces of the most warlike breeds. The consequence was that desire for conquest brought to our shores invaders from every quarter of the world, but the difficulties of approach weeded out all but the most daring and efficient in the art of war and seamanship. Those who settled blended into an English race, derived from a highly selected mixture of breeds, but united from the first in so far as they had inherited the traditions and characteristics which sprang from the practice of war.

The story of the last of a series of invasions, the Norman Conquest, supplies a particularly good illustration of the making of a race, and of the manner in which England absorbed the flower of the breeds which flung themselves upon her. While William, actuated by motives of personal ambition, was engaged in preparing his armies, Lanfranc travelled to Rome and secured the blessing of the Pope for William's banner, thus giving to the invasion of England the prestige of a holy war. By this means the leading knights of Christendom were attracted to the cause. The mobilization of the Conqueror's army led to the coalescence of different breeds for a common purpose. Though different, the breeds were necessarily similar, in that they had memories of war, for it was only breeds with warlike traditions who could espouse such a cause. Distinct breeds gained homogeneity by combining for the common purpose of a conquest of more than ordinary difficulty. Unanimity gave rise to purity of race. If there had been no unanimity, or an attempt to combine breeds with dissimilar memories, a mongrel race would have resulted, such as the modern Eurasian or American, without past or purpose. Promiscuous mixture of breeds will always destroy civilization, as it destroyed Rome, and is now very obviously destroying England. In origin there was nothing promiscuous about the English race. The warlike Britons who conquered the country before the dawn of history were sufficiently vigorous to prevent any mixture of blood except with the most daring seamen of Norway, Iceland, and Denmark, and of the boldest warriors of Rome and Gaul. Their stock was finally enriched by the absorption of the Norman Franks and aristocratic leaders from every country in Europe. The loosely-organized Celts, who had learned no

more than the rudimentary organization necessary for hunting, were driven out of the fertile plains into the inhospitable hills of Scotland, Wales, and Ireland, while the great war-lords, with their warriors, settled down and mixed with the more independent part of the population, which had developed the distinctive traits and attributes of the English character. In the eleventh century the race started with this heritage from the past, and as its memories were exclusively warlike its policies were based on a virile code of service. The wisdom of sacrifice for the corps is instilled by the practice of war or the training for it. No such result can be derived from athletics, because athletics are not sufficiently dangerous to provide sanctions. As the life of a nation must always depend on the loyalty of its individual members, war is necessary to preserve the health of the body politic. This is an unpalatable truth which modern democracy must learn to accept. War is the source of social morality and of the sense of political duty. The character of the English race was moulded by military service to an extent which gave a unique impetus to our civilization. It is not impossible that eventually something superior to military tradition may be evolved. Manifest danger lies in reverting to something inferior, and then being rudely jerked back to military standards, and, more likely than not, to the most degraded sort of war.

English nationalism is based on breed, for only those of warlike breeds could adopt the virile purpose which led to England's destiny. For a silk purse cannot be made out of a sow's ear, however high the ideal may be. England did not become great by making herself the race cesspool of Europe into which foul and degenerate breeds poured. The sentimentality which has upheld the "right of asylum" for all who wish to enter England has encouraged a process with an opposite tendency to that which made the greatness of the race. From England to the colonies there is a steady emigration of our very best stock, for only the best can go with any hope of success. These go to inferior breeding lands where the race certainly does not improve. Meantime the country is flooded with immigrants, the physical and moral failures from every country in Europe. Invasion and conquest steadily replenished the race; industrialism as steadily degrades it, and the process is far advanced. It must lead to confusion of memory, lack of purpose, internationalism, and

the eventual extinction of civilization, as it has done in every other instance. The dark ages which constantly recur in history are not due to chance, but to loss of race purity—an evil which is not inevitable.

The race was developed by strict and undeviating conservatism, lapses being corrected by the pressure of invasion. Our oldest traditions quite obviously come from the North and from Frankish Gaul, and our culture differed from that of other European countries in that it was not derived exclusively from Rome. Northern races naturally tend to remain more conservative than those which have an easier struggle against climatic conditions. It is when wealth accumulates in a fertile land that vigilance is relaxed and tradition decays, if it is not very carefully tended.

Those who are conscious of the danger of tampering with the lessons of experience are accustomed to follow and be ruled by kings. They regard, with perfect logic, as the best statesman the man whose known descent has kept him for the greatest number of generations identified with the experience of the race. The king was elected but the election was not of the foolish democratic kind that came from Rome and has now spread over the Western World. The electors were carefully selected on account of their breed, and were all qualified statesmen. Their choice was confined within the narrowest limits, generally to the sons or brothers of the preceding king. Until feudal times there was no restriction of choice to the eldest son, the idea of selecting the heir by the law of primogeniture being a late development of the law of property. The value of lineage, however, lies not in the length of descent but in its consistency. Where there has been cross-breeding, there must be a breach with the past; but where there has been long continuance of good mating an old family becomes established whose members inherit memories of experience that make up the highest common factor of racial experience. Such people are representative of their race, for rank is in reality more significant than the guinea stamp, and a man may be most inferior without it. A race can be assisted or served only by the political guidance of men bred in its traditions.

The only people capable of selecting good rulers are those whose memories go back to the foundations of the race. If the importance of race is appreciated it will be admitted that the only satisfactory government is that of an hereditary

monarchy with councillors from the oldest families in the land. Kingship is founded on the realization that political initiative is personal and thought is a solitary process. The body politic is sustained by continual creative activity. If this is suspended its life fades and disintegration sets in. The functions of the royal prerogative are an extension of the principles of private property to the kingdom itself. The English Constitution was created when the kingship was active; but under the Parliamentary system growth has become impossible. There is no one who can make or modify the institution. Bureaucrats may or may not have capacity to administer, but seldom the capacity to create, because they owe their positions to intellectual qualities which generally impair the constructive faculty.

For the extension of military principles of service into law and government England was indebted to kingship. The idea may have originated with Lanfranc, or perhaps Hildebrand, but it is due to the constancy of William the Conqueror and his successors that it was brought to perfection. The country possessed an ordered civilization before the Norman settlement, and it was possible to superimpose a régime of a highly developed character. Henceforth the distinguishing feature of our system was the adaptation of the principle of service to every department of civil life. The system was a striking contrast to that of Rome, for *qua* individual an Englishman had no status or personal rights. The very word "right" was unknown to early law; and "droit" signified duty or privilege—a privilege being a power to serve. The law armed the man with the status of a serving member of the body politic with all the powers required for the performance of the services due to his lord, who was under a corresponding duty to protect his vassal in order to secure the efficient rendering of service to the overlord. Every member had duties, with which no one might interfere; but no individual, as such, was recognized as an independent unit with legally protected rights. Even up to the time of Elizabeth the individual without defined duties was liable to be flogged or outlawed. The unification of the country, which occupied the reign of the Conqueror, was achieved by insistence on *service* as against *right*. The Saxons, always too prone to talk in parliaments and parish councils, had lost, in their zeal for local patriotisms, consciousness that all the different breeds in England must combine and sink their differences for

the race. William knew that the Conquest had become possible owing to local jealousies, and that he would not have established himself but for the desertion of Harold by the northern levies. As even the lesson of Hastings was disregarded he decided to eradicate the political vice of home rule by an example so terrible that it might be remembered for ever. Selecting a rebellious district where local squabbles had led to invasions and raids ever since the withdrawal of the Roman legions he carried out a complete massacre of men, women, and children, and totally destroyed their houses, their cattle, and all their possessions. He then turned the district into a desert by covering the fertile soil with salt, so that not even a blade of grass might help to obliterate the memory of the punishment. With fire and sword and salt, to sanction wise constructive statecraft, local bickerings were brought to an end, and in little more than a generation England emerged from the chaos caused by the rivalries of a collection of backward and quarrelsome little nations to become one land and one people—the strongest and most civilized nation in Europe.

The best instance of the policy of unification, on which the existence of race depends, was the last great act of the Conqueror's reign—the exaction of the oath of fealty at Salisbury in 1086. Hitherto feudalism had involved the allegiance of the tenants-in-chief only to the King. The result was that if one of these rebelled he could command the allegiance of his own servants and vassals against the King. By the oath at Salisbury this was changed, and allegiance was exacted not only from the principal lords, but from all their dependants as well. Modern officialism has reversed this policy, and the unreformed feudal practice now prevails in government departments, where loyalty to an immediate superior overrides loyalty to the Crown. The Report of the Royal Commission on the British Expedition to Mesopotamia contains exposures of modern practice. Again and again throughout the campaign the order of a superior was pleaded as an excuse for conniving at criminal negligence, and even treachery, which was the direct cause of the destruction of our armies. Like Lancelot, subordinate officials with a perverted sense of duty and " honour rooted in dishonour " maintained a treacherous loyalty to disloyal and incompetent superiors. The practice, though exposed, was permitted to continue, as it was considered contrary to public policy to discuss a report which, as

one famous ex-Premier said, might "break every one we know."

Thus from feudalism grew up the pure English tradition now known as Toryism. It was founded by William the Conqueror and perfected by Henry II and Edward I. This is the only pure political tradition in the nation. Side by side with it impure traditions have grown up, the main being Whiggery, dating from the Civil War and the Revolution of 1689, and Liberalism, dating from the industrial revolution of 1790 to 1850.

The Tory tradition has two branches—the White Rose and the Red. The first branch, which originated in the claims of the House of York, is extinct. Its doctrines, which were shared by the Stuarts, consisted in the indefeasibility of the Royal Prerogative, the absolute nature of monarchy, and the superiority of the hereditary claim to the throne over statute law. The Red Rose originated in the claims of the House of Lancaster. Its doctrines, which were shared by the Tudors, are based on the theory that there is a steady growth of tradition, custom, and law; that the constitution consists of a King, who reigns by hereditary right and the acceptance of the people; that Parliament advises the King; and that law is mutually agreed upon by King and Parliament. The agreement between King and Parliament is the supreme authority that can make all things lawful. This theory descends direct from Edward I. The White Rose aimed at the suppression of Parliament, Whiggery at the suppression of the Crown, and the domination of Parliament by great families. The Whigs, in the interests of individual licence, which they call liberty, are opposed to the exercise of those royal powers from which property is derived. Thus the Whig theory of politics has no origin, foundation, or objective. It has deprived the institution of private property of any rational basis or logical defence. Its flaws gave rise to Liberalism, which was based on the fiction of the sovereignty of the people, and had as its ostensible objective the pretence that all would participate in the benefits of private property uncontrolled by authority. The fraud having been exposed, the nation is now faced with the alternatives of going on to Bolshevism or returning to its national traditions.

The Tory is therefore a royalist as opposed to a republican, and a constitutionalist as opposed to a believer in absolute monarchy. He believes in aristocracy as opposed to oligarchy.

It is the essence of aristocratic government that the ruling class should be selected for their qualities and should have hereditary privileges. As forfeiture for misuser was an essential element of private property; so a peerage could, and perhaps still can, be revoked in certain cases; for an aristocracy is distinguished from an oligarchy by its dependence on the King, who is the selector of men, and can revoke privileges. An oligarchy is a body with no selector—a self-sufficient body, whose claim to rule rests solely on the fact that it is in possession. The former is feudal with positive objects and services; the latter is individualistic, with no thought save for its own gain.

The Tory relies upon the agreement of all classes in Parliament, not recognizing the special rights of anyone but contemplating the mutual services of all. Classes are defined by distinctions of professions. The different aptitudes and training, required for different occupations, produce varying characteristics, apart altogether from origin or environment. These variations give rise to distinction of class. The combination of bodies of men, associated by similarity of occupation, has the advantage of developing character and special qualities which flourish in congenial surroundings. Highly specialized qualities demand a class setting where peculiarities are appreciated and protected. Edward I provided for the representation of classes, so that Parliament might be the voice of all the services which contributed to national life. "What touches all must be approved by all." Every member could speak on behalf of some active function of the body politic, instead of, as at present, representing a bare majority of discordant individuals, most of whom are trying to prey on the body politic and to get as much as possible out of it for themselves. The artificial unit of a constituency lacks even the advantages of territorial representation, already sufficiently provided for in the House of Lords. National tradition provided a hierarchy of orders by which political power was graduated in accordance with the importance to the race of the duties performed, and not, as in democracy, according to the numbers of individuals. The aristocratic method secures freedom, and any other results in the vesting of political power in an oligarchy. The United States is ruled by millionaires, England and France by party caucuses. In every case democracy tends to divide nations into two classes with hostile interests—a small plutocratic or bureaucratic

minority which rules, and the whole body of the people who must obey. In its democratic frenzy a nation throws off the checks imposed upon the extravagant claims of wealth and intellect, to find, when too late, that the aristocratic chains were chain mail.

. . . . .

The first political institution in England was the kingship, which delegated to lords the powers of government over districts. In the thirteenth century the Crown entered into fixed engagements with the lords guaranteeing their security and freedom. These guarantees were extended in turn to those whom the lords governed. The Crown also entered into fixed engagements with the small freeholders of land and the burgesses of towns. At the end of the fifteenth century the old class of lords was destroyed or impoverished by the Wars of the Roses, and its ranks were replenished from the smaller freeholders and richer burgesses. In the middle of the sixteenth century the land of the Church was confiscated by the Crown and divided among the new lords as the price of their support. This policy was supported by the burgesses because it removed the ecclesiastical prohibitions which limited their indefinite powers of commercial activity. In the middle of the seventeenth century the Crown attempted to revive and exercise its functions of national control, and became the victim of a coalition between the *nouveaux riches* and the burgesses. The result was the revolution of 1689, which established the supremacy of the Whig oligarchy and the suppression of the Crown. The enormous expansion of trade led to the deliberate increase of the population by the introduction of inferior breeds. The wealth so created went entirely to the mercantile classes. The new population grew into a class of wage-earners without social organization or political status. By 1820 the majority of the nation was a dependent class without tradition or any of those organizations by which alone an individual can become a serving member of the body politic. Attempts to organize in self-defence and to claim status met with the resistance of the money-owners, and so resulted in a revolutionary movement and a reaction against industrialism. In 1832 the first extension of the franchise to irresponsible individuals without status, tradition, or patriotic purpose was carried through, in spite of the resistance of an equally irresponsible oligarchy;

and henceforth Parliament became a heterogeneous mass of individuals without part or lot in the body politic and a reflector of ignorant, unpatriotic, and irresponsible opinions. As tradition is the shrine of memory, the franchise is its shroud.

The present generation has forgotten that it is of no importance save as a link between the past and the future, that its salvation lies in protecting and improving the heritage of the past. It has used accumulated wealth for its own enjoyment, and has mortgaged the industry of future generations to relieve its own embarrassments, instead of realizing its destiny in the pursuit of the noble ideals of national service.

CHAPTER II

IMPERIALISM

THE acquisitive instinct is no doubt born of the desire for power over material things which arises out of the instinct of self-preservation. Property increases power and is an extension of personality. This extension is socially desirable in men of good taste. As with men, so it is with nations; and imperialism is based on the same principles as private property. Nations have a lust for conquest, for the same reasons as individuals have a desire for personal gain. It is an outcome of the most primitive instinct. Nations, like individuals, have to learn the lesson that acquisition of territory leads to responsibilities and involves performance of services, and that it is not held for purposes of mere enjoyment and gain. The desire for gain accompanies existence, but terrestrial conditions do not permit of gratuitous enjoyment. There is always a duty to be done, a mutual relationship to be established as between owner and property and between conqueror and conquered The man or the nation knowing this succeeds in accumulating wealth and in establishing breed or race. The spirit of service, so well described by our greatest living poet, is the inspiration of private property and imperialism. Most of the ancient empires were short-lived, and fell to pieces because they had no aim beyond establishing military occupations for the extortion of plunder and tribute. They ate up what they conquered and by their tyranny destroyed tradition, so that in a generation or less they defeated their own ends and were left with nothing to plunder. The statesman, whose motive in expanding territory is to provide bulwarks for the permanent prosperity of his race, does not conquer in order to ravish. Punitive expeditions, like the harrying of the North by the Conqueror, are justifiable in exceptional circumstances. The object of conquest is to pursue a constructive policy for the increase of the resources of the race. It is short-sighted policy to plunder another nation and destroy its culture, for the object of conquest is to make conquered territory permanently contribute

to the welfare of the conqueror. If ravished it cannot trade; and as the greatest of English imperialists said in 1739, "When trade is at stake it is your last retrenchment, you must defend it or perish." While the increase of material wealth is the object of conquest, this is not achieved by the baser material motives. "It is a mistake to say that England conquered by her materialism. It was our materialism that lost us America, but it was Pitt who had conquered it."[1]

The desire for order is rooted in instinct and is the basis of nationalism and politics. Nature in her days and seasons displays a regularity that the most primitive communities are bound to observe. The development of hunting leads to the growth of laws and customs; and agricultural societies are perceptibly more orderly. When organized war is evolved to guard against the avarice of others the highest ideals of order have their birth. Nothing is so orderly as military organization; and the passion for order is so deeply ingrained in human nature that no well-constituted person can see a regiment marching to a band without feeling his emotions stirred to their depths. It is this passion that forms the basis of the musical sense and gives rise to æsthetic appreciation of the artistry of organization. The soldier is by training best fitted to appreciate order and to place a high value on the traditions which produce it. He, above all men, will be reluctant to destroy it. It is the love of order which leads to the clemency of great military leaders, who appreciate the fact that conquered nations are best ruled through their own traditions. In this appreciation lies the superiority of Roman and English methods over those of other empires. Both empires were founded by soldiers who dispensed with the use of force at the earliest possible moment. The Roman *imperium* was established to protect subject races from aggression and to allow them to develop their own culture and trade peacefully within it. British India was conquered and has always been held by soldiers of a numerical strength quite inadequate to the task of holding the Empire by martial rule.

There is a large measure of similarity between Roman and English imperialism—due to the fact that both systems were based on the traditions of defensive war. The differences between the two are partly traceable to climate. A northern

[1] Wingfield Stratford: "History of English Patriotism."

race tends to be very conservative, because departure from principle is more dangerous to it than to the inhabitants of southern climes. Its character, being sternly moulded, has greater constancy, if less brilliance, than that of the Latin races, and is displayed in greater strength and at the same time greater gentleness and honesty. Rome was a city State, England an agricultural nation. A city in the midst of a fertile country, where life for dwellers on the soil is comparatively easy, may adopt policies very different from those of a nation that must extract a difficult living from cultivating the soil of a northern land. While England was a paradise of fertility for those who came from the same or higher latitudes, the life of the agriculturist here is one that requires more skill and application than the same occupation in the countries bordering the Mediterranean Sea. The law of Rome was not much concerned with the administration of land, and early developed conceptions of the importance of personal property. This was a natural development for a nation composed largely of town-dwellers. Roman law tended to attach the greatest importance to personal rights; the English law was concerned exclusively with the maintenance of the body politic.

Both empires have been based on reverence for tradition, and this is the only basis for permanent imperialism; for the destruction of tradition involves the destruction of race no less surely than massacre. Rome and England succeeded because they aimed at no tyranny over mind and art, but at keeping the peace so that life might develop in all its flourishing varieties within the *imperium* or *raj*. Many instances of race extermination can be quoted from Roman history, and it is not to be expected that an empire can expand without occasional acts that are impolitic or dishonourable. Mr. Pitt Rivers is bringing a serious and just indictment on this score against England. We cannot defend our treatment of the North American Indian, the Zulu, or the Maori, or the extermination of the Tasmanian, while the consequences of Christian propaganda are tragic. Yet in the main we have adhered to traditions of clemency, patience, and sympathy, and have founded great imperial services based on the principles of service, toleration, and encouragement of local culture and religion. The records of Rome and England, with all their faults exposed, hardly contain an act of deliberate policy comparable in barbarous brutality with the recent

bombardment of Damascus by a bad-tempered French general.

The trouble with the English is that their humanity has been excessive and they have carried toleration too far. They, alone of all European races, did not exterminate the aboriginal, and have in consequence been cursed with the constant irritation from surviving races within the British Isles which are still so primitive and barbarous as to regard murder and theft as normal occupations. They tolerate the moneyed interests who have introduced aliens to degrade the race, depress wages, and even dominate Parliament. The result has been the destruction of our noblest institutions and the ruin of our agriculture and industry. Intolerance is the last charge that can be brought against the English, who are individually and invariably tolerant to a fault.

The German criticism of English methods is entirely opposed to that of Pitt Rivers, and amounts to a charge that we occupy all the best parts of the world from which we oust more enlightened nations, and then do *not* impose our own culture on conquered races. (They add a rider that this is due to the fact that we have no culture to impose.) German imperialism, which has hitherto been singularly unfortunate, is not based on appreciation of the traditions of others. The rise of the German nation illustrates the development of type conforming to purposes and policies. The Germans conceived a definite notion which they called their culture, and elaborated policies, military, educational, and economic in accordance with it. The motive of conquest was to impose Kultur and to exterminate all who did not accept it. Imperialism meant the destruction of all civilization except German civilization. Maimed refugees from German colonies in Africa and German brutalities in war are the results of consistent application of a policy fundamentally different from the policies of Julius Cæsar or of Clive. These methods are not peculiarly German. Belgium has been a far worse offender; France and Spain have been quite as bad. England is the one modern exception. All nations have tried to be imperialistic, and all except England have adopted the principles of Kultur. English imperialism has not been entirely free from it, but in English imperialism Kultur has been confined to the activities of the Christian missionaries, who are just as convinced as was the Kaiser that every one should adopt their religion and morality. English Kultur has no more definite aim than red flannel and

hymns for the heathen, but its results are in fact as fatal to native culture and race as Belgian colonization. The Christian is definitely opposed to the statesman. He says that life on earth does not matter, and it is only eternal life that we are concerned about. This may be all right in religion, but it is fatal to sound politics, and leads him to ignore the profound importance of race and its dependence on its own traditions and religions. The statesman is not concerned with any life but this, and has the supreme duty of maintaining races in health and perfection. He finds Christianity opposed to him throughout the East, and it is preached by the representatives of nations which have bastardized and degraded themselves. If the Christian Churches wish to retain any permanence they must contemplate the exigencies of race, for if not they will destroy life on earth altogether and there will be no one left to go to Heaven.

Kultur is the result of arrested development. It is the very essence of nationalism which is incapable of expansion. National consciousness and patriotism become so intense as to exclude capacity to appreciate any other culture, art, or politics. Marion Crawford noticed this as a characteristic of the French. He said that in many years' close study of the French he never met a Frenchman who sincerely admired any work of art or act of administration that was not French. Many Scots entertain similar notions about their own country and countrymen. No Englishman would quarrel with an attitude of intense patriotism, or even with exclusiveness as far as national ideals are concerned. Any nation must vanish if it loses faith in itself. The Roman Church says, "You shall believe what we tell you or be damned," and anything short of this attitude is not faith, but mere opinion. Men and nations cannot base their policies on opinions. There must be absolute confidence and faith to enable them to pursue policies effectively, and good breeding will produce it. Any well-bred man will admire the progress of his own race. Nothing is more certain than that for him personally the environment, traditions, and laws of his race will be the best, because he is rooted in his race. Knowing that, he is apt to overlook the fact that other peoples are in a similar relationship to their environment and traditions, and for them his traditions can cause nothing but confusion and failure. Red flannel has been most serviceable in Yorkshire, but it has killed many excellent people who were persuaded to take to it

in Oceania.[1] It is most dangerous to interfere with the purpose, policy, or morality of individuals, for to do so creates disorder and sets the individual on a course that may be inconsistent with his past and his environment. The purpose which moulds national politics and shapes a race's destiny may be changed; but this involves national revolution.

Imperialism depends on realizing this and never imposing any tradition or religious belief on a nation, except such as is consistent with those which have developed naturally. As a race depends on absorbing breeds without destroying their purity, an empire depends on absorbing nations without interfering with their nationality. An empire should add to the power of each nation to develop its own culture and preserve its freedom. There is a tacit understanding that there shall be mutual trading relations. Rome had no difficulty about this as she absorbed the whole civilized world. The British Empire is in an economically unstable position. Having conquered India and fostered the growth of her dominions with her sea power and financial resources, England has allowed all her dependencies to become independent without making any economic conditions or giving any economic advantages. The consequence is that all the dominions have set up tariffs against Great Britain, though they borrow from her very freely; and in the Great War, when all alike were threatened, England (not including Scotland or Wales) found seventy-five per cent of the men and over eighty per cent of the money for the war. When it is remembered that the inhabitants of the British Empire number about a quarter of the population of the earth, and that England is a country not much bigger than Belgium and smaller than most of the States of the American Union, it is perhaps not surprising that there should be among her sons some pride and patriotism.

It is difficult to fathom the motive of English imperialism. As far as economic advantages go it would appear that treaties

[1] There is no apparent good, but not much to be objected to, in proselytism so long as religion is confined to its proper spiritual sphere. The Roman Catholics in England, who have had severe lessons in the past, realize this and do not interfere in politics. Where, however, they are all-powerful, as in Ireland, they interfere right and left with the most disastrous political consequences. The fault of the Puritans always has been that they will not realize that religion has nothing to do with morality. Indeed, their religion is only an excuse for moral and political interference, and their influence has, in consequence, been subversive of order, and destructive of health and breed. The vice of priesthoods is to use their unrivalled opportunities to seize political power. This vice is invariably fatal to religion itself.

would have secured more than has been won by conquest; for we have not excluded trade rivals from our markets. England stands with unchallenged sea power, commanding the Mediterranean Sea and the Suez Canal, with the Indian Ocean from Aden to Australia and from the Cape to Singapore as completely controlled as an inland lake. She holds the waterways of the world; and yet all the world's shipping passes along them as freely as if the Union Jack flew at every masthead. Every exporting nation seeks her protection to flood the markets of the Empire and undercut British goods with its own cheap and inferior produce. While any American ship can carry coasting trade between British ports there has not been one act of reciprocity from any nation except Portugal. We have not bargained with our might.

There is obviously no direct material motive in imperialism, for England has not only refrained from taking advantages in colonial markets, she has not even troubled to prevent herself from being excluded from them. Whether the Empire can be held together on any permanent basis, regardless of economics, is a question outside the scope of this book, which deals only with motives.

The motive of English imperialism is to be found in the superabundance of energy which supplies the spirit of adventure. It was greatly stimulated by the law of primogeniture, which forced younger sons to go out and seek their fortunes. The Empire was built up by private enterprise, without any concerted plan. Critics, in the light of after events, find Machiavellian motives in everything. But in truth most things in this world are done without much forethought. Sir Edward Grey in 1914 appeared to Germany as a sinister and fiendish schemer, when in fact he had just drifted from day to day with fatal blindness and lack of policy. There was little policy beyond personal ambition and adventure to account for the making of the British Empire. Clive and many others found themselves in unexpected predicaments, and acted as Englishmen are wont to do in the circumstances. Bank clerks become kings and commercial travellers command armies; gentlemen become pirates and convicts found orderly communities. The English have followed their instincts, and their character has produced this collection of democracies, ancient civilizations, crown colonies, and coaling stations called the British Empire, with the seas for its vital arteries. Outside the Empire a crop of

republics in the Americas reflect English civilization. The Empire was founded by private enterprise, and has found its happiest results in abiding by it. The more the man on the spot is trusted, and the less the interference from Whitehall, the better will England fulfil her mission. In the period when nationalism has been destroyed by individualism run mad, and has necessitated the establishment of a vicious bureau, the Empire has suffered from centralization, and only in the brief period of Chamberlain's administration, from 1895 to 1903, has there been a return to sound methods. The Empire has to a large extent lost the advantage of the English character, with its sound and independent judgment, and there is hardly a corner of it that has not suffered tragically from official muddling and stupidity, the result of the overwhelming influence of Scottish Liberalism.

PART IV

THE INDEX OF ANARCHY

CHAPTER I

THE ETHICS OF REBELLION

IT was Chapter XXXIX of the Great Charter of King John, which, as Creasy says, guaranteed "full protection for person and property to every human being that breathes English air." In confirmation of immemorial laws, it enacted that "No freeman shall be taken or imprisoned or disseised or outlawed or exiled or in any way destroyed, nor will we go upon him nor send upon him, except by the lawful judgment of his peers and by the law of the land." "Nisi per legale *judicium parium suorum*," are the magic living words in this charter of English liberties. In other countries judicial functions were performed exclusively by a professional class of judges trained to decide questions of innocence and guilt. But in England it was declared to be the law that the King's officers must submit cases to be judged by the accused's equals. If he is a lord he may not be tried by common men, but may insist, as did Lord Russell so lately as the reign of Edward VII, on being brought before a court composed of hereditary peers. If he was a knight, then only knights could decide; and if a poor man, then to the judgment of poor men he must submit. In Scotland there was not the same insistence on equality, and the Scots law was that "No man shall be judged by his inferior who is not his peer; the earl shall be judged by the earl, the baron by the baron, the vavassor by the vavassor, the burgess by the burgess; but an inferior may be judged by a superior." It is significant that this was not so in England, and the inferior could insist on judgment by inferiors who were his equals. Thus later, when trial by jury was introduced, Jews could insist on a jury of Jews, a foreign merchant could claim a jury of the "half

tongue," composed partly of aliens of his own country; a Welshman could claim a jury of men drawn from the Marches. It is every bit as important to an inferior not to be judged by superiors as for a superior to be tried by his equals. The specialities involved in the performance of the different functions of political and social life develop points of view peculiar to each. Theoretically even an unbiased monarch cannot do individual justice. He and his statesmen and officials, however conscientious, have a central standpoint from which they view the interests of the nation as a whole, but each class in the nation necessarily pursues a course with its own peculiar idiosyncrasies and eccentricity. The perennial grievance, expressed in the complaint that there is one law for the rich and another for the poor, arises from the application of the same law regardless of the varying standards of class life and morality. Law is the outcome of morality, but morality differs fundamentally with the variations of class, of occupation, and of climate. Law must therefore be tempered, interpreted, and applied by reference to the standards of the class to which an accused belongs, that is to say, to the standards of his *equals*. Without this there is no virtue in the jury system. Better far that a man should be tried by a trained judge than by a jury composed of persons of another class, perhaps another race, or perhaps even of women, whose instincts, traditions, and prejudices render them incapable of forming an adequate judgment of the facts.

The Summary Jurisdiction and Jury Acts have entirely destroyed the guarantees contained in the Great Charter in so far, at any rate, as the poorer classes are concerned, and about one million people are put in prison every ten years in England who have never been judged by their peers, and for no offence except that they are too poor to pay a fine. When it was decided that an adequate deterrent for such trivial offences as exceeding the speed limit, riding on the footpath, and other slight offences no more serious than boyish pranks, was the imposition of fines, it was natural and necessary to arm the courts with power to imprison anyone who refused to pay. An unexpected element was introduced for the mass of offenders who failed to pay, not because they would not, but because they could not do so. To a man who is able to pay, the summons and fine amount to no more than a slight inconvenience, while to the man who cannot pay the

alternative of imprisonment with loss of wages, employment, and status is often tragic. The punishment which is hardly noticed by the wealthy is overwhelming to the poor. Incidentally, summary jurisdiction has resulted in the repeal of Magna Charta and the imprisonment of millions of persons whom Parliament only intended to fine.

With regard to indictable offences, where a jury takes the responsibility of deciding the facts, the Jury Acts have entirely repealed the essential provision of Magna Charta as far as the upper and lower classes are concerned. Juries are composed solely of middle-class people. There is a property and householder's qualification which practically eliminates the working classes, the only authorities on working-class morality, while exemption from service on juries is granted to members of the professional classes, including all who, like medical men and officers of the Army or Navy, are likely to be the most sympathetic and to display the most public spirit and social affection in dealing with problems of human nature. The consequence is that even the language of offenders is often completely misunderstood, and the working classes have an absolute contempt for the administration of justice in this country. Though this contempt is only half-conscious it is the result of the inability of one class to do justice to persons of another class, and is one potent cause of revolution. We read one day that a middle-class woman on a jury has hysterics over the lack of chastity of an aristocrat or a peasant and is so swayed by what is in fact irrelevant that not her oath or the dictates of reason or the directions of an able judge can induce her to bring in a proper verdict. On another day we read of a woman sitting in judgment and ordering a brutal sentence on a small boy who deserved no more than a whipping. Even a middle-class prisoner cannot be sure of justice, for the jury trying him, though of his own class, may be partly composed of aliens and women.

While the word "*parium*" in the famous Chapter XXXIX of the Great Charter has thus been, by implication of the Summary Jurisdiction and Jury Acts, repealed, and millions of people, at the rate of about ninety thousand per annum, have been imprisoned in England contrary to the provision of the Chapter, it is no less important to notice that the last clause of the Chapter, "*vel per legem terre*," has also been repealed. When, in their demands upon the king, the barons insisted on adequate guarantees for administration of

justice and the protection of liberty and property, they inserted a clause confirming the ancient provisions of the common law. Statute law was useful to lay down from time to time rules for services and taxation and matters of administration, to settle disputes as to the proper interpretation of the law, correcting erroneous judicial decisions, and the like, but even down to the time of Henry VIII and the Statute of Uses of 1534 it did not in theory purport to introduce innovations. The invariable practice was, at any rate to pretend, to revert to ancient usage, and for Parliament to intervene only to protect and enforce custom ; for it is a fundamental maxim of statecraft that government by tradition is the only alternative to despotism and tyranny. Law represents those traditions which have developed naturally and have been so generally accepted that there is a demand for their universal enforcement. It can never have any permanence or success where it proceeds on any other principle, where, for instnce, as in the case of the National Insurance Act, it attempts to enforce novel doctrines and to inculcate theoretical standards of conduct.

The best authorities are agreed that the word "*vel*" in the phrase "*vel per legem terre*" should be translated "and," and that the barons were intent upon safeguarding the only sound principle of legislation, as well as of administration. The interests of civilization demanded that the people should not be liable to the arbitrary rulings of ignorant or tyrannical officials, and should not find themselves in a false position because of some stupid regulation. During the war, among the innumerable follies of the Ministry of Food, farmers were ordered to plough land while snow lay on the ground, while fishermen were startled to find that Whitehall had decided on a new model for cobles, which were in a high state of evolution in the days of the Vikings. Those who kept pigs found that one department forbade them to feed the animals with anything they would eat, another forbade their slaughter, while the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals might prosecute if the pigs were pined. Just when it was most necessary to husband the resources of the country everything that ingenuity could devise was done to destroy them, and it was only because the great majority of regulations were ignored that the country managed to survive the war. Nevertheless grave injustice was done, for every one who knew and did his job was in a quasi-criminal position, and might be

prosecuted at the whim of any official who wished to make himself objectionable. And the same thing is going on to-day. Every statute, such as the Insurance Acts and the Education Acts, which enforces unwanted benefits by the compulsory principle, is in conflict with the traditions which are in fact the only basis of ordered conduct, and ought to be the only source and basis of the law. The consequence is that tradition is utterly destroyed, and in the process of destruction an enormous number of people have to be fined and imprisoned.

Democratic Parliaments have ceased to be the guardians of tradition and liberty, and have sought to maintain their own despotic power by the enforcement of doctrine and theory. It is a commonplace to-day to hear that we must respect the law, whatever it is. When did Englishmen ever really agree to such a proposition? It involves the end of freedom and true progress. The basis of our constitution is that we have a right and a duty to revolt against any law which does not fall within the sound principle embodied in the phrase "*vel per legem terre.*" The King's oath was intended to guard us against the whims of faddists and the theories of prigs, and no Parliament is representative which throws itself in opposition to the traditions of the English people. No Parliament has any moral or legal right to interfere with our habits, and the principal function of kingship is to prevent this.

Magna Charta, like the charters which preceded it, was a product of rebellion, and established the kingship on a contractual basis. When the contract is broken by the king he loses all claim to loyalty, for rebellion is the ultimate sanction that prohibits despotism. In legal theory a sovereign may have absolute legislative power, as the oligarchies which successively control the House of Commons have to-day, but in fact this power is definitely limited. Concessions made to the Nonconformist conscience and to hunger-strikers are proofs of the compulsion that can be exercised by the governed to modify despotic policies. Wise statesmen concede the right to revolt to people governed contrary to tradition, and indeed there is an absolute necessity for such concession, without which no race could survive a tyranny. It is obvious to every one that a House of Commons controlled by lunatics who ordered parents to slay their children would not be able to enforce its legislation. It is equally obvious to some people

that most modern legislation involves race-suicide and ought equally to be disobeyed. For instance, for two years before the war the Insurance Tax Resisters League openly flouted the law, and its members were prepared to be imprisoned rather than obey it. The matter was not tested out because the war intervened to save the Government, which dared not prosecute, from embarrassment. But the instance will serve to illustrate the principle of rebellion. Up to what point can the sovereign claim loyalty, and where exactly is the line beyond which he cannot go?

From time immemorial, and repeatedly down to the Great Charter of King John and the establishment of the Constitution by Edward I, as the expression of an agreement between the king and the classes, the principle to be applied was emphasized. The king reigned by hereditary right so long, and so long only, as he adhered to the oath not to allow any inroads in the common law. Common law has its natural methods of growth and development, not to be interfered with by legislation, for it has been realized by every sound statesman that no law can be permanent or effective unless it is the expression or codification of tradition.[1] If this principle is abandoned force becomes the only alternative. The principle is the only practical basis of statecraft. It follows that if the principle is abandoned the people must rebel against the force or suffer extinction. Those are the only alternatives.

Now the whole structure of the constitution as finally perfected by Edward I has been destroyed. The king's oath means absolutely nothing as against the decision of an oligarchy supported by a majority of the House of Commons elected on an unrepresentative and entirely irresponsible basis. Classes are not represented in Parliament at all, or, rather, one class alone controls every political party. We cannot have anything beyond a sentimental emotional loyalty to the Crown, because it is practically extinct, having been, as Disraeli said, reduced to a pageant. The king must sign anything his ministers lay before him, whether contrary to his oath or destructive of the few remaining national traditions. The idea that he is bound by agreement with the people to protect their liberties has been swamped by democratic ideas of individual representation. In such

[1] For instance, the Bills of Exchange Act, 1882, and the Sale of Goods Act, 1893, are perfect examples of good legislation.

circumstances there can be no real loyalty, and, in consequence, no ground on which we can oppose revolution.

By all means let us uphold the law, but it is incumbent on legislators to make real law that can be upheld. By all means let us be loyal, but it is incumbent on those who claim our loyalty that they should study to deserve it.

CHAPTER II

BIAS

HERBERT SPENCER has demonstrated that all specialization involves political bias, which, however slight, warps the judgment and clouds the vision. It does not require the influence of a great passion, as in the case of Othello, to create it, for even the slightest prejudice will be enough. The professional bias of the most level-headed and capable man, the sex prejudice of the most normal woman, will be sufficient to prevent political impartiality. As the status of every individual is dependent on the performance of some function of service it involves the acquisition of special knowledge, adaptation to special environment, and special orientation of ideas. Specialization involves, in fact, an eccentric standpoint, and it is neither possible, nor even desirable, that it should be otherwise. The specialist must be politically biased, and as all useful citizens are specialists, none, except the specialist in statecraft, can form fair political opinions. In short, in so far as a man is competent to perform any service to the community he will find it proportionately difficult to form sound political decisions, and the only persons who become competent to do this are statesmen who have leisure and freedom from bias. The art of statecraft depends on knowledge accumulated and tested over the whole range of human experience. The extent of this knowledge is limited, and its aspects vary with the capacity and point of view of the observer. Those aspects which can be seen from the standpoint of the statesman may be hidden from the observation of the specialist whose views are limited by the field of his speciality. The statesman's view may be no more extensive than that of the poet, the scientist or the the business man. It may even be more restricted, but it is different in that it takes in the only reliable aspects of knowledge from the standpoint of race interests. The statesman takes observations from a centre point, all others being politically eccentric.

Therefore, to grant the franchise to ordinary citizens as

individuals is to invite political decisions based on myriads of eccentric opinions, no two of which can be exactly alike, and none correct. The franchise definitely excludes the possibility of examining any political question properly. Thus there can be no sound legislation or politics in a democratic State, except such as are unconstitutional and carried through in defiance of the franchise. For this reason democracy cannot survive. Instead of government by tradition, which gives effect to the aspirations of race-life by giving expression to the will of breed, the franchise necessarily involves the invention of theories as a basis for united action. The divergence of purpose in an individualistic community would prevent cohesion altogether but for the adoption of theories. Hence the vogue of the doctrinaire in modern politics. Small parliamentary groups unite, each with a theory as its purpose, and use the legislative machine by making bargains with each other. This must happen in all parliaments based on an individualistic franchise, but the second parliament of Edward VII and its two successors provided the most striking examples of the process. After the election of 1906 the Liberal Party had an unprecedented majority made up of numerous groups of not more than fifteen or twenty members each. No two of these groups were in agreement on any measure. They combined in an alliance of mutual support, so that by a process of legislative log-rolling a series of statutes was enacted in conflict with the wishes of the enormous majority of the nation.

Bias is more pronounced in some specialities than others, and scientists in particular are often comet-like in their eccentricities. The common gibe at expert witnesses is that some scientists can always be found to support any contention. These divergent views are to be accounted for, not by insincerity or faulty logic, but by eccentricity of standpoint. Scientists are more liable to extreme eccentricity than any other class, for their relationship to the body politic is not governed by tradition. When Herbert Spencer wished to give an example of extreme eccentricity he referred to a father in an African tribe who, on the birth of a child, retired to bed to receive the congratulations of his neighbours while the mother went about her duties as if nothing had happened to her. This instance is less strange than the eccentricities of English scientists. In 1917, at the time when man-power was the question of most vital importance to the

nation, when every ounce of energy and every pound of material and every penny that could be raised was required for war, able-bodied men employed themselves at the public expense counting fleas. An elaborate document was officially issued containing "curves" and other elaborate information as to the variation in the distribution of fleas in the Metropolitan area before and after air-raids![1] The following year when the strain of war had become well-nigh intolerable and the nerves of the whole nation were badly frayed, another scientist, with bureaucratic authority behind him, treated us to the following suggestion for preventing accidents in factories:[2]

"... one wants to induce in all the workers throughout their hours of labour the same mental outlook as is present in the night-shift workers in the early hours of the morning. These workers have for the most part forgotten the pleasures and excitements indulged in shortly before coming on to the night shifts, and they have nothing but an unexhilarating breakfast and bed to look forward to. Such a mental state is impossible of achievement by the day-shift workers, but something in the way of mental calm and equilibrium can be attained by stopping all conversation except that relating to the work in hand. If the workers would consent to it, it would be a good plan to induce temporary deafness by plugging the ears and so shut out the noise of the machinery, which is in itself an important cause of distraction and fatigue. Again, if it were practicable—though it is seldom that it can be so—it would be of value to shut out the sight of surrounding objects by separating the lathes or machines from one another by partitions. The worker left to himself without sounds or sights to distract his attention would then concentrate himself entirely on the work in hand. It might be said that the monotony would be so great that nobody would stand it, but, would it not be better to work for, e.g., two, three, or three-and-a-half-hour spells every day under such conditions if the worker could thereby earn as much as he does under present conditions in two four-hour spells? However, these

[1] The Report of the Medical Officer of Health for the County of London 1917), obtainable from His Majesty's Stationery Office, price 1s. 2d., post

[2] Dr. Vernon's Memorandum published by the Ministry of Munitions (Cd. 9046, 1918), at p. 45.

conditions are mentioned only as an *ideal* which should be aimed at whenever possible."

Here we have instances of the scientific bias which has rendered learned and humane men politically imbecile. They differ, not in essence, but only in degree, from all other specialists. The knowledge accumulated in every branch of thought requires to be corrected and co-ordinated before it is ready for political assimilation. It must, for instance, be allowed that Mr. Keynes and the bankers are authorities on the gold standard. Mr. Keynes comes to conclusions diametrically opposed to those of the bankers. There is not a logical flaw in the arguments of Mr. Keynes, nor is there one in the reasoning of the bankers. Yet both points of view are biased, and to accept the one or the other without correction would be injurious to the interests of the body politic. Under the parliamentary system the practice is to follow the advice of Mr. Keynes while one party is in power, and the advice of the bankers as soon as another takes office, thus combining the disadvantages of two eccentric and dangerous theories. It is the consequence of having no statesmen capable of correcting bias. A similar course has been pursued regarding tariffs. Having experienced every possible economic disadvantage of Free Trade the country was in 1923 in such a serious financial plight that the Prime Minister, with characteristic and almost unprecedented honesty, risked his party's fortunes by an appeal to the electorate to adopt Protection as an urgent necessity. Beaten on this issue, the same man, under the influence of some other bias, accepted office twelve months later, when the financial position was worse, having pledged his party not to introduce the policy which he had formerly believed was essential. In 1924 he was apparently confident that he could carry on the Government without Protection. Another half year passes and the same man sanctions taxes, called silk duties, introduced in violation of every known principle of Free Trade and Protection alike, and in the face of expert advice tendered to the Government. The result of the silk duties has been disastrous to export and to shipping and all the subsidiary trades; and, for aught anyone can ever know, has resulted in a net decrease of revenue. This is an example of the administrative conduct of a man who must be admitted by every fair-minded person, to be the best Prime Minister who has been in office since the Napoleonic wars.

One of the special functions of statecraft is to correct every bias and not to accept the unrevised views of experts. From time immemorial the Constitution has provided the machinery for taking expert advice on matters of public interest, and the modern practice is to appoint Royal Commissions. The value of the method depends entirely on the commissions being composed of unbiased statesmen. Where men are selected on account of their bias the result must be as futile as it has been in every recent instance. There is no more reason to expect less bias from a Royal Commission than from a newspaper, if there are no statesmen serving on it. An author, who must necessarily bow before the criticism of the Press, naturally hesitates to point out that newspapers have been known to display bias in favour of the financial and party groups to which they belong. It is a fact, however, that there is also a Press bias of a peculiar kind arising from the fact that newspapers deal in *news*, and news only. The statesman deals almost exclusively with *olds*, and in consequence need pay little attention to the Press.

The most dangerous bias and the most difficult to guard against is the moral, or what might be called the policeman's bias. Morality, as Locke said, gives a bias to all the thoughts and acts of men. No task of statesmanship is more difficult or more essential than that of gaining complete emancipation from moral prejudice. Of all the vices of Victorian and twentieth-century politics the worst has been the complete subjection of statecraft to Puritanism. This influence has been so strong that it has destroyed tradition and upset the equilibrium of government. Government by tradition has now been altogether abandoned in favour of government by police. Individualism has naturally led to the necessity of putting control on individuals, and to the consequent establishment throughout Europe of police forces and hordes of officials. In England the population becomes more and more dependent on official control, and this control is now more costly than it is possible to estimate. As individualism bases the title to property on mere possessory claims, it traces to force alone the source as well as the sanction of law. Such a theory applied to politics must become the basis of morals and stimulate the motive for appropriation regardless of services. On the individualist hypothesis the moral claim to ownership disappears, for acquisition by purchase may have no more relation to the interests of the race than

appropriation by violence. The rights of property, order, and safety thus lose all moral sanction and rest solely on the force behind the law. Owners find that they have destroyed tradition by flouting it, and so cannot appeal to it for protection. Hence the demand for a costly police force is the direct result of the decline in morals. It is not only by weakening the moral fibre of the nation that individualism produces crime, for it maintains its sway by introducing great codes of regulations any breach of which is brought within the category of crime. These regulations are opposed to such traditions as survive, and so require a great deal of supervision. Thus the moral bias leads to the citizen imposing heavy taxes on himself to secure his own supervision and control. Officials are employed to interfere in every direction. Tradition being abandoned and lost, government is reduced to a scheme of official compulsion based on the tolerance of regulations by each individual. Each one detests but endures the system in order that he may derive benefits from the tyranny over others. When there is co-operation and mutual service, and the freedom engendered by tradition, all men appreciate the strength and welfare of their fellows; in competition they fear them. Thus the old regulations protected character; the new suppress it. Everything that weakens and thwarts a competitor is regarded as good; and fear and jealousy become the ruling passions which produce legislation and local regulations. During the decade 1901 to 1911, normal pre-war years, the country was taxed for the imprisonment of close on a million persons [1] who had committed trifling offences involving no more immorality than riding a bicycle on a footpath. The increase in regulations is a direct method of creating crime. Government through the instincts and traditions needs little machinery for the enforcement of law; but government by theory involves heavy taxation to enable the sovereign people to force on themselves the hated *benefits* provided by the paternal "State." Apart from the rates and taxes required to maintain public officials, the cost of living, and particularly of travelling, is greatly increased by private checks on honesty, which all involve a tax on the public. Besides inspectors of first instance there are inspectors of inspectors; and the point at which the hierarchy of inspection reaches its apotheosis is hidden from those who bear the cost of it. The elaborate steps that are taken to

[1] The actual number was 958,805.

see that we pay our railway fares, and the examination which every Englishman who lands at Dover must put up with from the Customs, may well give rise to sombre reflections as to the dignity of this imperial race. We hardly chafe under it now, for we know that dishonesty, the meanest and most costly of vices, is now almost universal. Hardly a session passes but Parliament devises new means for checking it, and each check increases the number of the parasites of vice.[1]

It is in connexion with the suppression of drink that the moral bias of the middle classes has led to the most serious impertinences. No one with any knowledge of the subject would deny that the evil of insobriety was great, but only the hysterical sentimentalist would attempt to justify the methods used to eradicate it. The case for the people is far stronger than the case for the licensed trade, which has been put with sufficient insistence. It has been pointed out again and again [2] that excessive drinking is an effect and not a cause. People rely on stimulants because they are weak, or because their lives are unendurable, or because they are mentally defective. The remedy lies in removing the causes, mental or physical, that lead to habitual drunkenness. The legislature has dealt with the subject as though every one were abnormal. Ninety-nine out of every hundred Englishmen are normal, and quite able to decide for themselves what they will drink and when they will drink it, and, if they occasionally make merry to an extent that is shocking to Puritan susceptibilities, they are but following the healthy and vigorous traditions of their race. Restrictions merely inconvenience the ordinary citizen without being of the slightest assistance to the vicious. As the London County Council's interference with prostitution has had no effect except to make blackmail its regular concomitant, so the licensing laws have merely added drugging and unnatural vice to that of drunkenness. General interference

[1] "The Report of the Food Council on short Weight and Measure together with the four volumes of evidence previously published makes out a strong case for the stricter and more efficient regulation by law of the sale of foodstuffs. It is difficult to understand how anyone can read the evidence without a feeling of consternation at the startling dishonesty, in a part at any rate, of the trade in these articles of universal consumption. There is, of course, no suggestion that the giving of short weight is generally prevalent, and the Report expressly points out that the Council have no wish to overrate the extent to which the practice prevails. On the other hand, enough has been proved to lead most people to the conclusion that it is desirable, both from the point of view of the consumer and the honest trader, not to underrate the opportunities which the absence of adequate protection gives to some tradesmen who take advantage of them."—"The Times," February 23, 1926.

[2] See Nietzsche, and also "The London Police Courts" by Holmes.

with liberty will not solve the problem of the drunkard, and it is no more sensible to tackle the problem by closing public-houses than to attempt to cure sea-sickness by sealing the patient's lips. The public-house is the poor man's club and serves a useful purpose, and Parliament has a plain duty to insist that there should be plentiful supplies of pure beer made from malt and also of well-matured spirits.[1] The closing of public-houses is a curse to the poor.

The offence of being found drunk in the streets or in public-houses is one created by the moral bias of the middle classes. It interferes with the liberty of the working classes only. The poor, owing to the smallness of their houses, live more in the streets. They are in consequence more liable to arrest. When arrested and found guilty their punishment is a fine of an amount which the well-to-do would not feel, but for the poor is prohibitive and involves as an alternative imprisonment and loss of income for dependants. Wherever a fine is considered an appropriate punishment the alternative to fine should not be imprisonment. Another alternative which would press less hardly on the poor could and should in the interests of the race be devised.

One of the most impudent statutes resulting from the moral bias is the Children's Act, and the universal resentment against it among the working classes is thus summed up by Stephen Reynolds :[2]

" As if they'd hear worse in a bar than they'd hear out and about from other children at school. Schools where they learns foul language. Pretty thing, if us can't look after our kids so well in a public-house as anywhere else, but got to leave them outside, in the rain, pr'aps, or else leave them at home wi' nobody to look after them ! Nice when you'm out for the day with your family, not to be able to go into a public house for ort ! . . .

" The Acts the same for everybody, they says, but it bears on the likes o' us ; 'tis a hit at our ways, a slur cast on us. 'Tis us that ain't got servants for to look after the kids an' keep 'em away from the fire, and walk 'em up and down at night. 'Tis us what goes into bars, so much for the company as the drink, an' an't got nobody to leave the kids in charge of. 'Tis us what wants to send the kids to the ' baccy shop '

[1] See the " Conservative Party and the Future " by Pierce Loftus.
[2] " Seems so."

'cause us an't got nobody else to send, n'eet time to go ourselves. 'Tis our kids what an't private grounds an' gardens to smoke in out of the policeman's sight. . . . They tries to drive us all into the policeman's lock-up wi' their rules an' regulations. . . ."

This tyranny of officialism must go on increasing until the ideals of national service are restored as the inspiration of a national policy. So long as attention is concentrated on comfort instead of service, and the nation is in consequence kept in a state of continual agitation about " rights," so long will it require the policeman and the lady guardian. The metamorphosis of politics has proceeded so rapidly that already it seems like trying to put the clock back to protest against tendencies which had hardly commenced in the reign of Edward VII. The statesman must be the more careful to be on his guard against the moral bias of the official class and be very careful not to look at politics through the policeman's spectacles.

CHAPTER III

THE ILLUSIONS OF INDIVIDUALISM

NO matter what the political system in vogue in any age or country, it is necessary for statesmanship to find means of concentrating the attention of the governed upon definite ideas as a preliminary to the acceptance of policies. Individuals if isolated cannot be governed except by force. They must be brought to unanimity by the concentration of attention on the purposes of policies, and they will then willingly accept the policies. To produce this unanimity is the first step in practical statecraft, and it is accomplished by symbolism. As it is impossible to get every one to understand political philosophy and essential to make every one accept it, the statesman has recourse to flags, catch-words, and other symbols which stand for the mass of ideas and motives which are generally accepted. The most successful statesmen have ever achieved results by giving the people an opportunity frequently to visualize the symbols of their political faith, and by so doing have appealed to purpose to justify their policies. The use of drama, and a sense of the theatrical, are essential adjuncts of statecraft, and they will lead to sound politics, provided the symbolism is true. Precisely the same method can be used with equal force to mislead and deceive, and the mainsprings of all democratic movements are illusions and their symbols. Dishonest politicians who wish to promote policies for some unavowed purpose use illusions with great effect to bring about ends in conflict with the interests and wishes of those they govern. The masses are too ill-informed to discover the illusory nature of the purpose, which is supported by paid advocates actuated by interested motives. Intellectual mercenaries are able to propound principles known for thousands of years to be false, and to display even passionate sincerity in doing so, because they acquire a habit of exercising an idealistic faculty which overrides their rational minds. The fact that they are pleading for chimerical ideals is easily

submerged in the solid satisfaction of reaping a harvest from promoting faith in illusions. In all wealthy nations prosperity is apt to be followed by the adoption of liberal policies. It is well enough known that these policies always lead to disaster and eventual extinction, and no one would adopt them if their aim were frankly stated. They are introduced by means of the illusion of individualism that all may share in the accumulated wealth of the nation without performing any tedious services. A nation struggling for its existence must be conservative on pain of death or loss of liberty, and having no accumulated reserves, offers no hospitality to the parasite. Thus poor and independent nations develop patriotism. Their hen-roosts are the more carefully guarded as they are less worth robbing. But when wealth accumulates some people are certain to turn their attention to the flesh-pots, and in those classes where tradition is weak, and education faulty, there is a reversion to primitive instinct and the desire to consume all in immediate enjoyment. The philosophy of exploitation gains ground as the material advantages of citizenship become more apparent than the need for the services that created them. Eventually tradition decays and disappears and a class of wealth-owners with a system of philosophy designed to justify their existence creates a political party to uphold their " rights " and repudiate their " duties." Commerce becomes a system for enabling the non-producer to exploit productive industry while those engaged in production are forced to carry an ever-increasing burden.

The illusions of individualism, which have served to hoodwink England since the accession of William of Orange, are set out in the works of the political economists. Their effect on the minds of practical business men is well illustrated in the " Confessions of a Capitalist " by Sir Ernest J. P. Benn.[1] This book is a ghastly exposure of Liberalism, and its author admits that it is in " bad taste, dealing as it does with matters which by common consent are not usually written or talked about " ! Its title is somewhat misleading, for it is not a book on capitalism, but on the irresponsible moneyed interests, and it shows how those interests are created. In describing the politics of the middleman it provides the best apology for red revolution that has yet been published. If anything could justify the methods of Moscow it is this essay, whose

[1] Published by Hutchinson, 1926.

author boasts that it is put forth without "literary capacity, art or style." Sir Ernest says frankly that he has accumulated power to control enormous sums of money, and he describes graphically his lack of time and capacity to educate himself. Lack of education is, however, no disadvantage to him, for we gather he thinks art and style are used only "to shield bald facts," and that any man must therefore be better without them. By business-like methods the confessor arrives at the astonishing conclusion that "wealth is exchange," a definition he considers superior to that of John Stuart Mill. The expression "business man" is used in the book, not to describe the capitalist or merchant, the producer or distributor, but the non-producing irresponsible owner of money, who, it is alleged, deserves to take a larger income out of industry than the producer. The control of productive industry by the moneyed interests is justified in the following sentences:

"Thanks to the *wealth-producing power of exchange* even the poorest of us receives more than a single individual could ever produce." "Because it is, as a rule, far more difficult to exchange an article than to make it the *business man* generally secures a higher remuneration for his part in wealth-production than the labourer who performs the simpler and easier work of wielding the hammer and the saw." "One justification for this lies in the fact that exchange involves risk, and the recognition of this element of risk is of primary importance."

These sentences entirely obscure the economic issue. The capitalist, the wage-earner, and the distributor have nothing to do with the control of exchange. They form together the united interests of productive industry. The moneyed interest has succeeded in getting control of distribution and in splitting these interests by directing the political agitation of the wage-earner against capital. The real issue in economics does not involve any question as between capital and labour, whose interests are obviously identical. The question is whether it is politic to allow the moneyed interest to control prices and markets so as to exploit producer and consumer alike, or whether productive industry should control all the means of distribution and exchange. That is and has been the only economic issue for centuries past. It was the

economic issue at the Reformation and the Civil War. It is the economic issue to-day. The majority of the population are vendors of goods or labour, and in consequence national interests are wrapped up with the interests of productive industry. Its prosperity can be maintained only by keeping prices at a high level and protecting it from undercutting and free competition. Such methods reduce the power of the moneyed interests and raise wages, as we know by the experience of all protected countries. The moneyed interests have guarded themselves against this policy by persuading both capital and labour to play into their hands: capital by inducing it to lower wages, and labour by inducing it to agitate for cheap goods. Illusions have been used to rule the world, and none has been more potent than that of cheapness, which cannot serve the interests of any functioning member of the body politic. It can serve the purpose of the moneyed interest alone—a small group of bankers and alien financiers. The reference to men who wield the hammer and the saw obscures the fact that this interest gets more profit for farm produce than the farmer and landowner together. Sir Ernest Benn says they are "not . . . unconscious of the ethical side of all these problems, but . . . they are concerned for the moment with the *more practical* aspect of affairs."

"The Confessions of a Capitalist" is a book worth reading as an illustration of the amazing complacency with which the irresponsible money-owners regard profit. Anything and everything that makes a profit for an individual is assumed to be good. While, of course, all business must be conducted on sound financial lines, and profit is the test of sound finance, they forget that it is a test of finance only. It supplies no test of business policy, which should be regulated for the service of the race. The long-exploded theory of Demand and Supply is still made to serve as a governor and regulator of economics, and the risk of the speculator is regarded as a sufficient sanction for individualism.

It seems superfluous to flog Demand and Supply, now that it has been so long dead. It was from the beginning devoid of capacity for practical application. Sometimes demand or supply or their relation to each other causes a rise or fall in price, sometimes not. Sometimes supply creates demand, as it did when steam engines were introduced. More often it does not, for about ninety-seven per cent of patents find no market. Sometimes demand stimulates enterprise, but in

many essential things it does not. A recent agitation for good bread by a well-known newspaper was abandoned when the editor considered he was creating a demand that could never be supplied because the vested interests were too strong. In fact Demand and Supply is but one among many of the illusions with which individualism drives a subservient race.

CHAPTER IV

THE ILLUSIONS OF SOCIALISM

SOCIALISM also owes its existence to illusions, but these are neither so dangerous nor so foolish as the illusions of individualism. Individualism is a reversion to pure barbarism, but socialism is on a far higher moral and intellectual plane. The illusions of socialism are not very important, for if socialism were ever a political force in England that force is now spent. The attack on private property, both in land and in the means of production and distribution, could never have assumed its present dimensions had it not appealed to the greed of paupers and criminals. The spurious philosophy of socialism has been the only saving grace without which the attack would have been wholly criminal. The genuine socialist, now almost extinct, was a half-baked Tory. He wanted to regulate private property like a feudalist, but he did not allow for personal ties or for any incentive. His sins were rather of omissions than commission, and he was so well-meaning and so far from being practical that he could be treated indulgently. He was followed by the Fabian Society which for about thirty years continued to rouse curiosity, until with the rise of Lloyd George it was exposed as a huge bluff. The Fabian policy bore no resemblance to socialism proper, nor was it in any respect original. It merely aimed at adopting the bureaucratic policy of Bismarck, an old French policy which had been adapted to Germany to enable the middle-class intellectuals to dominate what they called "the proletariat." After a generation of painful and vociferous labour the mountain of socialist philosophy caused consternation and dismay to its votaries by producing the bastard mouse of State socialism. The parliamentary parties had, however, been so long barren that all alike welcomed the Franco-Prussian foundling, which has been assiduously mothered ever since. These socialist reformers, however, never had the smallest intention of improving the condition of the working classes or of reverting to a communal system of ownership.

Honest socialists of the calibre of Hyndman had been hoodwinked and bluffed till they had the humiliation of watching while Lloyd George used their pet phrases and distorted their theories in order to rivet bureaucratic fetters on productive industry for the benefit of the financiers. Except for the attack on the landlords, which was a feint, there was no attack on the unrestricted licence of individualism. Indeed, the increase in the National Debt, which was the main object of the Lloyd George policy, was designed, in the words of Lord Beaconsfield, " to mortgage industry in order to protect property."

The Labour Party has for reasons best known to itself chosen middle-class intellectuals as its leaders. These leaders have expressed very guarded views in the Labour Party book, which should reassure anyone who fears that there is danger of revolution from the pitiful political efforts of this party. Forces cannot be made from vapour, and there is no fear of organized revolution in England, because there is no strong enough aim or sound enough policy.[1] The literature from abroad and the discoveries of Scotland Yard affect only a small section, which is either irreconcilably criminal or suffering from a sense of self-importance. It would be well indeed if the country were faced with no greater dangers than those which come within the purview of the police. Unfortunately there is a danger far more terrible than revolution, which is itself evidence of vigour. There is on all sides evidence of a steady process of disintegration of every social institution. This could be arrested by hope in a sound policy for the preservation of race interests. To give such a hope is the duty of a statesman. If he fails, the best he can expect is bloody revolution, and the worst that which we are now witnessing, the disappearance of the race. There is no danger of revolution. Would that there were, and if there were the best way to avoid it would be, as Bacon said, to take away the matter of it. The Labour Party is not founded on hope, but on despair. It has never had an enlightened leader, but the working man has had no alternative offered to him by the aristocracy. The man who calls himself a Socialist does not know how to express himself. He has tried to avoid despair by pursuing illusions, while wealth and

[1] The modern Englishman likes to say we shall never have revolution in this country because the people will not stand it. The truth is that we are in the same danger as other people if a purpose is once generally accepted. In such an event action must follow.

power have passed into the hands of people without taste. When there is talk of confiscation by the Socialists it is as well to remember that it was not socialism that resulted in death duties, the most unprincipled of all capital levies, nor did the Socialists invent the income tax, which even Gladstone condemned. The Socialists have not advocated the increase of the National Debt, nor limited liability, though the introduction of limited liability was no doubt the cause of the wholesale creation of Socialists. If the responsibilities of property were restored there would not be a Socialist or a revolutionary of English breed in this country.

CHAPTER V

PURITANISM

THE statesman is not concerned with the theological aspects of Christianity or any other religion. His duty is to remain free from all religious bias so that he can study with impartiality the effect of religion on morality, health, physique, and social order. With regard to Christianity in England, as with regard to all the religions of the East, he must apply a principle as a basis for toleration or interference. He cannot shirk this responsibility, even if it lead to a conflict of faith so serious as to produce the most terrible of all political calamities, except one—civil war. The exception is the disappearance of the race, a disaster which is sometimes caused by religion and can sometimes be avoided by war. The question that must be frankly faced is whether it is possible for a Christian nation to survive. There was no need to ask the question in the fifteenth century, and the fact that it now presses for an answer shows that Christianity has in the meantime not confined itself strictly to the spiritual sphere but has had a profound effect upon politics. In the fifteenth century Christianity was a healthy spiritual force, encouraging every exhibition of health and enjoyment. Now it is represented by the killjoy policy of the Puritans and the London County Council's ban on eating chocolates. History proves that it is possible to be a Christian and at the same time to be a first-rate Englishman. It is undoubtedly impossible to be even a normal man within the scope allowed by the London County Council. No wise man would attempt to live what a lady guardian would regard as a strictly moral life.

The traditions of England were originally Nordic, and all our institutions as well as our morality developed out of them. Their key-note was the glorification of strength, as befitted the hardiest of races. The standards of morality and the sense of humour of the Sagas would not fit with weakness or ill-health. Even old age was hardly tolerated, and when a man felt in the early forties that the first signs of middle age

were appearing he generally chose to seek death in battle. We are told that men with grey hair were seldom seen, though chiefs and bards might survive to old age. Sport consisted in hand-to-hand contests or going single-handed to kill a bear. Neither man nor beast was attacked with missiles discharged from a safe distance, such methods being considered cowardly and degrading. In conditions which involved death as a result of the slightest failure there was no room for weakness and no sympathy with it. Such was the source of the character of such Englishmen as the Widdrington who was

> in doleful dumps
> And when his legs were smitten off
> He fought upon his stumps.

To men of such temper came the early Christian missionaries to tell of the incarnation of a God who preferred death to compromise, and taught that gentleness was the finishing touch of strength. There is all the difference in the world in preaching about gentleness to men who hardly know what weakness means, and preaching a justification of weakness to feeble folk. The case was simply stated without the elaboration of the Pauline doctrines, and a type of religion suitable to the pagan character and traditions of the English developed naturally. By the time of the Crusades the English were so terrible that to them alone Saladin could afford to give no quarter. They certainly did not " turn the other cheek," but asked no quarter and gave none, and this was the measure of their conversion to Christianity. Their devotion and faith produced the art and civilization of the Middle Ages without weakening their morality or clouding their traditions; for there was nothing in the direct commands of Christ to clash with their ideals. To men with strongly developed social instincts the command to serve God with all the heart and mind and strength and treat a neighbour as themselves would sound very like their own military and naval discipline, while it would involve no weakness in conduct towards neighbours. During the Middle Ages the critic of politics could find little to trouble him in English Christianity.

After the Reformation the whole aspect and character of Christianity was changed in consequence of its union with entirely different traditions and an alien morality. It would serve no purpose, if it were possible, to trace the change in

politics to religion or the change in religion to politics. Suffice it to point out that neither a false religion nor false politics can come to men or nations whose purpose is sound and sincere. Fundamentally, therefore, the change in religion and politics were both effects and not causes, however they reacted on each other. English Christianity, the religion of freemen, is now extinct. It could not possibly survive, for the modern race is not capable of it. It has been replaced by Christianity in its original continental form, the religion of slaves. Its peculiarly anglicised form, which is now universal throughout the English-speaking world, is known as Puritanism. It is not so much a religion as a system of morality. It is designed to enable conquered races to triumph over their conquerors by degrading them. It provides a philosophy for failures who cannot endure life and look to compensation after death. It teaches that, if men are bad enough, weak enough, foolish enough, miserable enough, stupid enough, ignorant enough, dirty enough, and ill enough, they will go after death to mansions of heavenly bliss, where they will triumph over all that has been beautiful, healthy, strong, and successful in life. Instead of being slaves they shall "judge angels." Vice and disease are to triumph over virtue and its resulting strength. Such is the talk of the slave compound: of those who cannot bear to worship the "God of things as they are," and must substitute a god of things as they wish them to be. It has produced a system by which weakness and disease have imposed their deadly precepts on all that is healthy and noble, and by which art, beauty, culture, and health have been banished. Such is the modern Christianity whose exponents are now creating disorder throughout Europe. Until a few years ago there was hardly an advocate of disorder who did not gain political influence by starting as a local preacher of these degraded doctrines.

Religion, instead of being restricted to its proper spiritual domain, has been the pretext for the establishment of moral tyranny. The very people who argue in favour of individual liberty are the advocates of "State" interference. The theory is that if the "State" can by interference with liberty make men more moral such interference is not only justifiable but necessary to deliver them from their vices and make them more free. Thus the liberties of the people have been seriously infringed, and there is no doubt that the wage-earning class has suffered more from these restrictions than any

other class. It is, however, argued that if in practice, the interference involves exceptional restraint upon the freedom of the working class it is because, either from lack of education or force of environment, that class is less moral than others. Such arguments are based on the assumption that there is only one tenable code of morality, and if any class has morals differing from the ordinary code it must necessarily have worse morals. In fact, however, there is no absolute standard, and morals differ as classes and occupations differ. The prevailing morality in England at the present day is one suitable to the middle classes alone, and their standards of education and taste have been forced on the upper classes and lower classes alike.

Sociologists, from Disraeli to Stephen Reynolds, have observed that the working classes are marked off from the rest of the community by their employment, their resources, and their manner of living. They live in their own quarters in the towns, they intermarry and form friendships exclusively among themselves, and have intercourse with other classes only for business purposes. They are isolated by their circumstances and are distinct from the rest of the community in their ideals, customs, and morality. One experienced observer [1] thinks that the ethical views of the poor "taken as a whole, can be most justly described as different from those of the upper classes than as better or worse." Masterman, quoting these opinions,[2] states that "most of the present-day failures in legislation and social experiment are due to this fact. It has been assumed that the artisan is but a stunted or distorted specimen of the small tradesman; with the same ideals, the same aspirations, the same limitations; demanding the same moulding towards the fashioning of a complete product. We are gradually learning that the 'people of England' are as different from, and unknown to, the classes that investigate and record, as the people of China or Peru."

Morality is conditioned by environment, occupation, and aim, and when the conditions of life and ideals differ, customs and morals must differ also, for instinct supplies a people with those best suited to it. It is impolitic to interfere, for instinct has in the case of the working classes supplied a philosophy of life singularly appropriate to their circumstances. This philosophy is disconcerting to social reformers

[1] Miss Loane. [2] "The Condition of England."

because it is in many respects diametrically opposed to the moral standards of Puritanism and the middle class. The main conditions of peasant life—poverty, manual labour, uncertainty of occupation—have hardly been modified by industrialism, and the traditions of country-bred ancestors are as useful to-day as ever. "In the real essentials of morality the poor are, as a whole, far more advanced than is generally believed, but they range the list of human virtues in a different order. . . . Generosity ranks before justice, sympathy before truth, love before chastity, a pliant and obliging disposition before a rigidly honest one. In brief, the less admixture of intellect required for the practice of any virtue, the higher it stands in popular estimation."[1] Justice suggests the attitude of the Charity Organization Society towards the "undeserving poor." Love, after all, is a positive, chastity merely a negative, virtue.

A moral code suitable to sedentary employments and shop-keepers must be ill adapted to men engaged in hard bodily labour and exposed to the elements as well as to an uncertain future. It must be injurious to the class to break down its normal traditions, and it is safe to predict that a continuance of the foolish legislation of the past fifteen years will destroy tradition, undermine character, and substitute for a healthy peasant and artisan class a working class with middle-class traditions such as exists to-day in America.

The Puritans may contend that although the working classes have a distinct morality of their own, and a morality that is on the whole adapted to their manner of life, the practice of such virtues as thrift, industry, and sobriety must be desirable no matter what their mode of life may be. Though this proposition may be self-evident to middle-class minds, there is, in fact, considerable doubt as to the intrinsic value of these virtues to the lower classes. The virtues themselves have not been held in great honour prior to the establishment of Puritanism. The great moral systems, aiming at ideals more noble than material comfort, have recognized the spiritual dangers attending them. The Ten Commandments made no reference to thrift, industry, or sobriety. The Old Testament tells us that wine maketh glad the heart of man; Proverbs is the only book in the Old Testament that deals with sloth and idleness: and Hebrews evidently regards work as a necessary evil, and not as a virtue in itself. Apart from Puritanism

[1] "From their Point of View" by Miss Loane.

Christianity treats thrift with suspicion or contempt: "Lay not up for yourselves treasure upon earth," "Consider the lilies," the story of Martha and Mary, and the parable of the labourers in the vineyard, may be cited in opposition to the claims of industry and thrift to be counted among the Christian virtues. Stephen Reynolds considers that to a working man thrift may easily be an evil rather than good. He says: "From the standpoint of the essential, as opposed to the material, welfare of the poor it can easily be overvalued. Extreme thrift, like extreme cleanliness, has often a singularly dehumanizing effect." [1]

Industry, again, is a virtue, whose practice by the working classes is obviously desirable to other classes. One of the principal reasons why the traders supported the Reformation so enthusiastically was that they chafed at the frequent saints' days of the Church which involved holidays for workmen. Complete absorption in work may be praiseworthy where the work is worthy of a man's whole attention, as in agriculture or art—though it always has an anti-social tendency. But where the work does not satisfy the capacities of the mind, as in industrial operations where specialization has robbed labour of the attraction of variety and the satisfaction of creation, extreme industry is merely slavish. Irresponsibility is often the result of exhaustion caused by long hours of monotonous work.

As to sobriety, it cannot be argued that habitual drunkenness is anything but harmful, though total abstinence, like any other form of asceticism, is destructive of human sympathy. Puritanism has by depriving the people of sufficient healthy excitement rendered the stimulus of excessive drinking necessary. If the stamina of the body and mind were restored they would be impervious to the effects of alcohol.

To the statesman the discussion of the relative merits of different codes of morals is merely academic, while reverence for tradition makes him the natural guardian of all. The morality of the people resembles that of the aristocracy in being instinctive: "By the complete yielding up of themselves, which they are always doing, and by the dissipation of their own lives, the plebeians bear some resemblance to the aristocratic type, and this latter type has much more in common with the former than with the middle-class type." [2]

[1] "A Poor Man's House."
[2] "On the Track of Life," by Dr. Leo G. Sera (English translation).

The differences between the upper and lower classes are mainly due to differences of instinct arising from different experiences and conditions. The instinct to command, essential to the aristocrat, would be useless to the working man. The instinct of solidarity is necessary to the worker, but of less importance to the upper classes. The functions of both classes lie principally in the exercise of natural gifts. The middle classes live more by their wits and are compelled to develop their intellect. They require an intellectual morality for their own satisfaction. Like every dominant race and class that is not aristocratic the middle classes have striven to force their morality, their philosophy, and their religion on all who come within their influence.

Instinct is the surest guide. Intellect may bring success to individuals or even to a generation, but it is never developed save at the expense of instinct, and atrophy of instinct renders a race incapable of survival. The Greeks substituted democratic standards of intellect for the aristocratic standards of beauty and physical prowess, and became a race of clever parasites.[1] All over Europe the intellectuals are the plague-spots of communism and revolution, of pessimism and despair. Their writings carry the infection of weariness and disgust.

The statesman must make it his care to improve the conditions of the race without destroying character. He must attempt to humanize social legislation and make it fit all the various types and customs of which the nation is made up. He must adjust the law to the minds and temperaments of every class; for it is better not to legislate at all than to put nature into a strait waistcoat.

[1] "Hungry Little Greeks": "Graeculus esuriens" (Juvenal).

CHAPTER VI

THEORY AND SOCIAL REFORM

WHILE unanimity with regard to purpose is essential to the existence of a race no phase is politically more dangerous than the unanimous acceptance of a theory. Under its dominance a nation will persecute or deride all recusants and critics, and will carry it to its logical conclusion a *reductio ad absurdum*, which exposes the folly only when too late. Unanimous acceptance of a fallacy is invariably succeeded by unanimous recantation, induced as much by weariness of its reiteration as by disgust at the excesses of its votaries. Unanimity on the doctrine of equality led France logically to the Reign of Terror, and ultimately to the Empire. Unanimity on the doctrines of individualism brought England to the shame of industrial servitude, and so inevitably to the reaction of State Socialism.

It is therefore with misgivings that the statesman must notice that dominant democratic doctrines now escape serious criticism and meet with no opposition. No politician who values his reputation as a practical man dare profess aristocratic principles, though in fact, these only require restatement to become universally tenable. When Baldwin's second administration took office in 1924 it was bound hand and foot as to policy by the unanimity with which the nation had accepted or acquiesced in the Liberal and Socialist policies of its predecessors. Application of these policies by force had already killed the opposition which had been strong prior to the war, because it had stamped out the national traditions on which that opposition was based. Liberals were infected with Socialist hallucinations on the equality of man, while the Labour Party were afflicted with the Liberal mania for middle-class morals. As to Conservatism, it was extinct owing to the smothering of thought by the dilettante intellectualism of Cecil influences. These mental diseases now pervade the nation, and all parties are bent on "social reform," identified with schemes to give effect to the theoretical equality of man by producing artificial uniformity.

There is not now a Conservative in Parliament who appears capable of questioning the underlying principles of the legislation which the parties vie with each other to produce. The Conservatives have become pioneers in the most extravagant expenditure on schemes for disseminating middle-class morals.

The cleavage of parties in our political system began in Tudor times with the rise to power of the moneyed interests, which successfully revolted against the regulations which had been devised for the protection of character, physique, and productive industry. The productive interests, represented by the owners of land and capital, as well as the labourers and artisans employed in agriculture and industry, were combined in a national party, which received a crushing defeat at the hands of Cromwell. The moneyed interests, represented by merchants, bankers, and other non-producers, eventually developed into the Whig, afterwards the Liberal, Radical, or Free Trade Party, whose opposition to all control gave rise to the political doctrine of *laissez faire*. During the eighteenth century the efforts of Conservative statesmen were confined to holding the balance between agriculture and industry. By 1848 the interests of agriculture had gone to the wall, and only the feeblest struggles for the protection of productive industry took place in the nineteenth century. In fact, the only notable movement in Parliament was that of the "Young England" Party, which produced the Factory and Truck Acts, directed against conditions which had called forth national feelings of "shame, terror, and indignation." Outside Parliament there grew up the trade union movement to safeguard the sectional interests of labour. By the beginning of the twentieth century the interests of productive industry were nominally represented by a Unionist Party, strongly diluted and afterwards swamped by Liberal elements entirely opposed to agriculture and production, and by the Labour Party, which was sectional in aim and hopelessly misled. These two forces were thrown into opposition just when their combination was essential to national interests. Each party saw clearly the faults of the other without recognizing its own treacherous conduct. The Labour Party could denounce the Unionists as representing the Liberal forces of uncontrolled and unpatriotic finance, which dared only fitfully to advocate an emasculated policy of protection, and, except under the leadership of Chamberlain, not even

proposing to put essential taxes on food. The Unionists, on the other hand, despised the trade unions for their sectionalism and their suicidal policy of free trade, alien immigration and nationalization. The two streams of political representation being thus divided, the moneyed interests obtained an overwhelming victory in 1906, which, under the misleading names of Liberal, Coalition, or Conservative, they have, but for a brief interval, maintained for twenty years.

The Labour Party is now left with the possible destiny of restoring protection for productive industry. It has hitherto failed for lack of leadership, and unless this fault is remedied it can only continue to give expression to discontent instead of hope of reform. Bankruptcy of statesmanship produces agitation and rebellion. The people who fulminate against revolution are no better than the people who promote it; for where there is no statesmanship there can be no hope.

So fatal was the lack of leadership to the Labour Party that actually in 1906 that party formed an incongruous alliance which swelled the parliamentary ranks of the moneyed interests. The alliance had strange legislative results, the strangest of all being the extension of the false legal principle of limited liability to torts. For over forty years the principle had submerged the law of contract in the interests of irresponsible traders, and the Trades Disputes Act, 1906, provided a *quid pro quo* by relieving the unions from responsibility for tortious acts committed in the war between "capital and labour." That the principle is a bad one no one can deny, but it is of comparatively little importance as the law stands with regard to tort. Its general application to contract is the really serious matter requiring attention. It is, however, easier to eradicate from the law of tort because in tort there is nothing but the Labour Party to defend it. In contract it is backed by the overwhelming power of the moneyed interests, and no politician could contemplate the restoration of the law. It may, however, be refreshing to all who hold shares in limited companies to recognize the principle embodied in the Trades Disputes Act.

Though the moneyed interests had an unprecedented majority in the House of Commons, without any effective or intelligent opposition from the Unionist Party, which they very largely controlled, the position they had to face in the country was in 1908 exceedingly formidable. A surplus population had been created by alien immigration, designed

to reduce the standards of living and wages. Provision for this surplus, which was necessary for the stability of the industrial system, was becoming year by year a more acute problem, known as the "unemployed problem." The disastrous consequences of over sixty years of free trade had to be faced. The revolt of organized labour against the dominance of the financial interests represented by the party in power was becoming every month more menacing. Finally by-election reverses were threatening even the parliamentary position. The industrial system was in a critical condition, the only remedy for which would have been the imposition on the moneyed interests of regulations which those interests were politically too powerful to permit. In these circumstances the Cabinet decided to employ means to postpone an industrial and political calamity which could not possibly be averted by any of the means which the politicians were able and willing to use. The postponement was effected by huge subsidies for the wage-earning classes, supported by bureaucratic methods in imitation of those applied in Germany by Bismarck.

Hitherto the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer had been one of trusteeship for taxpayers. Chancellors had been under an obligation to keep a close check on expenditure in all departments. This salutary principle was now deliberately abandoned, and a Cabinet of political desperadoes initiated the schemes of spoliation connected with the name of Lloyd George, which that politician himself described as "robbing hen-roosts." Taxes were levied and money was diverted from the repayment of debt to provide subsidies, and to Gladstone's grants for free education were now added doles in the shape of old age pensions, doles for the unemployed, doles for the diseased, and doles for mothers. These doles temporarily saved a situation that appeared desperate. From 1901 to 1911, though the population was increasing, the total amount paid annually in wages to the working classes had decreased by £3,000,000. In the same period the cost of living on the basis of wholesale prices increased 13·4 per cent. Meanwhile the purchasing power of money was falling rapidly. Thus in a period of increasing prices the working classes were receiving less in real wages than ever before. By 1912 they were receiving less than a bare subsistence allowance. If wages paid at that date are compared with the minimum allowance for the maintenance of an average family a large

sum (which cannot be precisely estimated), amounting to between £100,000,000 and £150,000,000 annually, was necessary to supplement wages and cover the deficit between what was absolutely necessary for the support of the wage-earning classes and the amount they actually received in wages. This deficit, which has of course been far greater since the war, has been made up of charitable and semi-charitable contributions and State doles. In London alone there were before the war more than nine hundred charitable institutions distributing money, or food and clothing. Such is the desperate condition of national finance due to free trade that the wage-bill of industry is to a considerable extent paid out of taxes and rates. The wage-earners are provided with free education, continuation schools, free food for their children, fares below cost when they travel, free medical attendance, insurance against unemployment, ill-health, and old age. By these means the country has gone more than half-way towards complete nationalization of labour, and when once started such a policy must be pursued to the end, no matter what party is in office, until free contract shall be abolished altogether and the labourer without wages will be provided with necessaries and hired out as a State-owned slave to the controllers of industry. Indeed, complete slavery would be an improvement on the present uncertain and haphazard state of affairs. The measures adopted by Parliament have not attempted to tackle any question comprehensively. They have aimed at preventing revolution by bribery and enlisting into the official classes such labour leaders as appeared to have an embarrassing influence. Parliament has not interfered to insist on a living wage and a proper standard for the maintenance of the race, nor has it interfered with the deliberate policy of keeping a body of over a million unemployed for the reduction of wages. Nor are opportunism and expediency the sole causes of this *ad captandum* policy: the most important cause being that the government and so-called representative institutions of this nation are controlled by less than three per cent of the population, who are an irresponsible, non-producing, unpatriotic class and wish these things to be. If the trade union revolt had been intelligent it would have been justified. It was, however, as unintelligent as the landlords who, after being ruined without putting up a fight, submitted to the indignity of being blamed as engineers, when they were in

fact victims, of the system. The trade union attack was skilfully diverted to the landowners, and the diversion held public attention while the scheme for the bureaucratic control of revolution was elaborated.

In order to understand the bureaucratic measures adopted since 1909 it is necessary to appreciate the causes of the revolt of labour. " Labour unrest " was never properly investigated in Parliament or outside, and the only views that found expression were those of journalists, which were so biased as to be worse than useless.

Democracy means, and has always meant, government by middle-class intellectuals, who lack the inherent power that alone enables men to govern by tradition. Democratic formulæ enabled the demoi of ancient Greece, the plebs of Rome, and, in their turn, the bourgeoisies of modern democracies to suppress the aristocrats and to exploit the slaves and the proletariat. Socialism itself, as we have seen, is merely a tendency towards the establishment of the power of middle-class bureaucrats. The causes of this tendency are not hard to find. Aristocracy at the height of its success may easily become too complacent, and is apt to neglect the safeguards of tradition. In particular it may forget to provide for the maintenance of a class of thinkers who can preserve and develop the science of politics. The consequence is that only those writers and thinkers who cater for the middle class get a livelihood. This gives the middle class an overwhelming advantage over other sections of society. When once the aristocrat is excluded the middle class alone has the business experience and ability requisite for the conduct of public affairs, and thus its dominion is placed beyond dispute.

In England the more plebeian section of the middle class, many of them large employers of labour, saw possibilities for themselves in democracy, while the intellectual section saw their opportunities more particularly in Socialism. Specious doctrines easily captured the working classes, while, under cover of a struggle against the aristocracy, political fetters were forged for the people.

In an unguarded moment Mr. Masterman disclosed the secret: " Every reform successfully effected transfers whole divisions and army corps from the attacking to the defending army. The giving of old age pensions, for example, at one stroke swings half a million aged persons passionately on the side of the *status quo*, passionately against any upheaval

which would jeopardize the regular reckonable dole of two half-crowns per week." [1]

"To anyone who realizes that the '*status quo*' is one of bourgeois predominance, the most apparently innocent of radical measures show a Machiavellian ingenuity. And indeed social reform, as practised by the radicals, as unanimously approved, betrays its bourgeois-democratic origin at every turn. Radical reforms are actuated, no doubt, to no small extent by a desire, entirely praiseworthy and indeed necessary, to improve the condition of the people, which is certainly in many respects the reverse of satisfactory. But this desire is adulterated by the prejudice in favour of middle class morality and by the need of the middle class for good workmen, and is further vitiated by the prepossessions, derived from the doctrine of equality, as to the preponderant influence of environment and the efficacy of State interference. The result is that Radical legislators tend to regard men on the economic and material side (for even the morality of the middle class is largely based upon economics), to the exclusion and neglect of the spiritual side. Thrift, industry, and temperance are assumed to be cardinal virtues. They are so regarded by the middle class, and have in fact secured for this class worldly success and material comfort. The general practice of these virtues, therefore, by the working class will make them more moral, more comfortable, in fact, more like the middle class. Incidentally these virtues will produce a peculiarly manageable and profitable workman. Strong in the consciousness of rectitude and benevolence, convinced of the infallibility of his principles and the sagacity of his methods, the Radical proceeds to convert the people to his morality, and to organize them according to his tenets, with the ruthlessness and fanaticism of a Mahomet. If the people object, it is because they are ignorant, or because they are beasts and love their animal vices; they must not be spared; the bourgeois democrat, like Torquemada, must rack their bodies to save their souls." [2]

This element of compulsion which enters into almost all recent social legislation is an unmistakable sign that something is being forced upon the people which the people do not want, and which, if left to their own choice, they would not have. In other words, compulsion indicates that some tradition of the people is being attacked. The ignorance of the people

[1] "The Condition of England." [2] Crawford Cree's unpublished notes.

was only to be cured by education, and, of course, that form of education which had proved so successful in the case of the middle class. But this species of education did not meet with the approval of the people ; they would not send their children to school, so education was made compulsory. They have had to be compelled to believe that it is good for them to be educated like clerks ; they wanted technical instruction, but unfortunately the bourgeoisie are only just beginning to admit that that desire was well founded now that it has been forcibly eradicated. The National Insurance Act, designed to create a spurious form of thrift, had perforce to be compulsory because people are foolish enough to dislike deductions from their wages and to wish to spend their own money as they think best, and compulsion is applied, as it must be applied, by inspection and police courts. Those who are ignorant of working-class conditions can hardly realize the extent to which people are inspected. Apart from the school attendance officers, the sanitary officials and relieving officers, and the officials of the local authorities, most of whom have the power to hale before the police court anyone who shows the least independence or the slightest resentment or disrespect, or whose behaviour fails to coincide with bourgeois standards —apart from these State spies and *agents provocateurs* there is a horde of unofficial busybodies who associate themselves with some organization chiefly for the purpose of indulging an inordinate craving for interference. The combined activities of these prying locusts have converted the home of the working man into a mere observation cell.

Whether in the streets, or in the public-house, or even in his own home (so exposed is a small house to the street) the working man is almost immediately under the eye of the policeman ; and recent legislation, by increasing the number of artificial offences, has enormously increased the policeman's power. Mr. Stephen Reynolds mentions the case of a man who was arrested and punished for using obscene language in his own home, and justly points out that the man was only expressing himself in his own language, however different from that of the middle class and however offensive to bourgeois ears, and that if he had been rich enough to live in a larger house he would not have been heard by the police at all. The slightest infraction of any of the innumerable restrictions that now hedge round the life of the poor, and a man is brought to the police court, where, after a feeble attempt to

defend himself, he is condemned to a fine, which, if it is not impossible to pay, involves hardship for his family.

The Labour Party, which professes to represent the working classes, and the Liberals, the self-styled champions of liberty, were for a generation in league to shackle the freedom of the working classes. The Liberals in the attempt to combine the two contradictory principles of equality and liberty found it necessary to abandon both. Professor Hobhouse, after whittling down equality to equality of opportunity, further modified this definition by adding that " it does not necessarily imply actual equality of treatment for all persons any more than it implies original equality of powers. It does, I think, imply that whatever inequality of treatment . . . there be in a good social system, it would rest, not on the interest of the favoured individual as such, but on the common good." Liberty he " palms " away like a skilful conjurer as follows: " We have seen reason to believe that their (the school of Cobden) conception of liberty was too thin, and that to appreciate its concrete content we must understand it as resting upon mutual restraint and value it as a basis of mutual aid. For us, therefore, harmony serves better as a unifying conception." When we leave the Liberals to their attempt to bring order into their magpie's nest of pilfered doctrines and turn to the Labour members we see practically the same thing. In the words of Mr. Masterman, " They may perhaps stand for the working man in opinion. The majority of them are certainly remote from him in characteristics. Many are Scotsmen; and there is no deeper gulf than that which yawns between the Scotch and the English proletariat. They are mostly men of laborious habits, teetotalers, of intellectual interests, with a belief in the reasonableness of mankind. He is much more allied in temperament and disposition to some of the occupants of the Conservative back benches, whose life, in its bodily exercises, enjoyment of eating and drinking, and excitement of 'sport' he would himself undoubtedly pursue with extreme relish if similar opportunities were offered him." [1]

" Labour unrest " was a spiritual and moral as well as an economic revolt against the whole order of democratic society. Again and again politicians and business men have been baffled at the apparent unreason of the working classes over economic problems because they would not understand that

[1] " The Condition of England."

the real problems were not primarily economic. The unrest is a race revolt against moral tyranny, and it is only by a complete understanding of that fundamental fact that the key will be found which unlocks the doors which have hidden the secrets of the revolutionary spirit, as well as of those Liberal bureaucratic measures which are now the dominating factors in our political system.

The Insurance Act of 1911 served two important purposes. It was so complicated that it baffled all criticism, so that the opposition never discovered its meaning until it had passed through Parliament, and it provided the means for the most extensive patronage. The legislation was so complicated that it provided an excuse for the appointment of a large staff of interpreters and subordinate officials, and appointments to this staff were made of persons who might prove politically dangerous and who could not otherwise be cajoled or bribed. Thus were the finance and organizations of the unions and friendly societies brought under direct political control, and if labour leaders became too powerful they could be offered tempting salaries *at a distance* from the localities where they exercised their influence. The great organizations of the friendly societies, which, as voluntary and independent institutions, had supplied for many generations the finest schools of constructive statesmanship, were completely changed in character and their officials were made petty Government servants, without the standing or self-respect which in the past had made them persons of considerable local importance and influence. By this policy the very fibres of the social structure were destroyed, but a fabulous revenue poured into the insurance companies.

In 1861 Sir Henry Maine wrote that " the movement of the progressive societies has hitherto been a movement from status to contract." Since then we have evidently come some way over the arc of civilization and are receding from contract towards status. Unfortunately we are drifting, not to status as it was in the old days, wrapped up with the institutions of the family and private property, in which the personal nexus was the governing factor, but to an impersonal status where the source of power and government lies in fictions like the " State " or the " Limited Liability Company."

Wages in the modern sense are an innovation, still in the experimental stage. In the Middle Ages they were unknown, and the word had an entirely different signification. It was

part of every contract of service that the labourer should receive proper accommodation and proper allowances of food and ale. Remuneration in money then called "wages" resembled soldiers' pay in the Army to-day, and was an allowance in cash over and above the provision for the necessaries of life. This system of remuneration made the working classes independent of the fluctuation of prices. During the eighteenth century an attempt was made in industry to exploit the old plan of remuneration. Workmen were receiving remuneration directly from the employer, or, indirectly, through "tommy-shops" in which the employer had an interest, articles which were not a real equivalent of their wages. An employer would engage a man to work with a promise of payment in goods and cheat him by giving him goods of an inferior quality or at an exorbitant price, or would engage him with a promise of money and then cheat him by pressure to take goods. Sometimes wage-earners were supplied with goods beyond the value of their wages, thus giving an employer the additional powers of a creditor. Thus the old system, which still works well in agricultural and domestic service, was so gravely abused in industry that Parliament, under the influence of the Tories, passed the Truck Act (1 and 2 Wil. IV, c. 37). This statute applied only to industry, and made it illegal to pay any part of a man's wages in kind, the principle being that the workman should receive the whole of his remuneration in cash and should have a free hand in spending it. That is to say, while the system was based on the principles of individualism, the Conservative Party insisted that those principles should be applied throughout, and that the workman should have the advantages as well as the disadvantages of the system. The Truck Act was consistent with the idea of private property and the responsibility it involves, and it remains on the Statute Book, though Parliament has lately made serious inroads on its principle. A man is no longer allowed to control the expenditure of his own earnings. First he was compelled to spend fourpence a week on one kind of insurance, and then twopence half-penny a week on another kind of insurance because this was necessary to Lloyd George's plans, and now he must spend something more because Baldwin finds it convenient that he should. It is only a matter of time until the whole of his wages will be appropriated in portions dedicated to the memory of one or other of our demagogues, and labour as a commodity will be

nationalized. The wage-earner may have the best of reasons for disapproving of national insurance, he may dislike the method of education to which his children are submitted under compulsion, and he may disapprove of this compulsion being exerted at too early an age; he may resent the fact that he may not select the quality or strength of his liquor or the time when he may consume it; but he must put up with these things and face the fact that in the course of less than fifty years he has lost the greater part of his freedom. If he is a thoughtful man he will wish to rebel against a further increase in these terrible "benefits." If he submits apathetically, or gladly, then he will contribute to the downfall of his race.

There is nothing wrong with the principle of insurance as such. Lord Randolph Churchill sketched a scheme of State insurance on Conservative lines which would have enabled the working classes to insure themselves against the inevitable evils of sickness, accident, and old age; and in 1914 a Bill on sound financial lines providing greater benefits than those promised by Lloyd George was introduced into both Houses.[1] The vice of the existing Act is that it is based upon the compulsory principle. Its object was not to provide real benefits but to carry out the policy of subsidizing labour.

The foregoing considerations will be sufficient to show why Baldwin's administration, depending principally upon Liberal or Liberal-Unionist votes, has made no effort to impose regulations upon industry which will protect high standards of living and labour, but has tamely carried on the policy dictated by the moneyed interests. There is nothing surprising in the fact that the Conservative administration of 1924 had not been six months in office before it proposed to extend the policy of subsidizing labour by a further levy, amounting to as much as the cost of a big war, but it is surprising that support should have been given to the scheme by the Tories, who seem to think that any policy is good so long as it is well-intentioned, even if it involves the destruction of productive industry. The Tories seem to have forgotten that the worst measures are begotten of good intentions. At first sight it may seem praiseworthy in a Conservative Prime Minister that he should seek an alternative to the dole as a means of avoiding starvation. Starvation is, however, a check on population (and so on unemployment), as well as a stimulus to energy. Life exists on a balance maintained by

[1] By Willoughby de Broke, J. W. Hills, and Sir R. Cooper.

stimulus and check. The vice of State aid is that it abolishes both without substituting alternatives. Subsidies tend to stimulate the birth-rate among degraded types, and to produce quantities of cheap labour for exploitation, and at the same time destroy the motive to work. Any alternative method of avoiding starvation will but repeat the evils of the dole system. The insurance scheme is identified with the dole in principle, in that it is intended thereby to save the surplus members of the working classes from starvation by means other than the exertion of their own energy. In plain English this amounts to slavery; for we may with sufficient accuracy define the political institution of slavery as a system by which people are saved from destruction by some force outside themselves. This much-maligned institution has not been properly appreciated as a means of protecting the weak and unfortunate. In some circumstances it may be a very good thing. As it existed in the Roman and English systems it was an adjunct of the institution of the family. That was a different matter from the impersonal State slavery of Lloyd George, now so greatly extended by Baldwin. Slavery of this sort, or, as we perhaps better call it, nationalization of labour, cannot be a good thing.

It is hopeless to expect that any good can come of looking for an alternative to the dole. There is one remedy for unemployment, and one only, and that is employment. As far as women are concerned there is not even an excuse for the dole. All over the country there is a demand for domestic servants. The result of abolishing the dole would be to make thousands of idle and useless women eager to be useful. It might reduce the wages of domestic servants, but there would be no harm in that. Domestic servants are housed and fed, and their wage is surplus pocket-money. As to the "unemployed question" as far as it affects men, it has been deliberately created by legislation. The import statistics show that we are paying hundreds of millions of pounds a year for alien labour. A tenth of it could be spent at home and would employ everybody. We have the absurd spectacle of Englishmen kept idle in an artificially flooded "labour market" while we pay money to get things done abroad which we cannot afford. Then we give doles to the "unemployed" and do not ask them to work, though within our own country we have necessary work urgently requiring to be done and no capital available to pay for it. A great part of

our agricultural land is going out of cultivation owing to the neglect of drainage. Lancashire and Yorkshire are suffering from " over-production " of cotton goods and woollen goods, and Northampton from " over-production " of boots, while a large section of the people are in need of these things. The trouble of unemployment does not arise from shortage of work but from the fact that individualistic enterprise has resulted in imperfect collaboration. Instances could be multiplied to show that, apart from dictation by the moneyed interests, there is neither necessity nor excuse for our present taxation and subsidies. They spring from one cause only: the failure to apply sound principles of statecraft on which the permanent foundations of society can be based—a failure that is due to ignorance and to reluctance to join issue with the unpatriotic controllers of our financial system.

CHAPTER VII

TRADE UNIONS

IT must be evident to every serious student that statecraft, based on certain axioms, is dependent on the application of principles by men who incorporate in themselves the secret of power. Whether a principle can, or can not, be practically applied is a subjective question. When a politician at Westminster says that a particular principle is "not practical politics," he is not condemning the principle, but himself, and the false standards to which he is committed. He is, without realizing it, admitting that he is, either by breeding or training, unfitted to be a Member of Parliament. In tackling the question of the trade unions—a very simple question—it is hardly likely that members of the House of Commons, elected on an individualist scheme of representation, will find any principle "practical." If the House could achieve anything in the nature of a collective sense of dignity it would leave the whole matter alone, and trust the native sense of Englishmen to find the obvious and only possible solution. If Parliament were an assembly of representatives of all classes, as Edward I conceived it, there would be no difficulty about applying principles. As it is in fact constituted it can do nothing but harm by interference, and one principle will be as bad as another because there is no one with the power to apply it. There is a small section of the House of Lords which might intervene effectively, but it would have to display amazing courage to make the attempt, because two centuries of apathy have practically blocked the constitutional opportunities of the peers. In fact, the trade union problem must be tackled by independent statesmen outside Parliament. Parliament can do nothing effective because there are no traditions on which legislation can be based. In time, when new traditions have grown, privileges can be conferred in return for services, provided the privileges are deserved.

The trade union movement was from its inception doomed to come to a disastrous end. The unions never made a serious attempt to become genuine political organizations; that is to

say, they never even pretended to supervise and develop the relationship of trades or workmen to the body politic. They sprang up when status had given place to free contract with the object of strengthening by combination the bargaining power of the workmen who were at a disadvantage in the face of free competition in a designedly over-crowded labour market. They were intended to be no more than a protective barrier against the employers. The unions were combinations for the purpose of protecting their own members, without any purpose of service which could justify such protection. Capital was regarded as an enemy to be thwarted and defeated, and the unions were looked upon as the means of carrying on an internecine struggle to split the interests of productive industry.

When any society appeals to the law for recognition and privileges it should show that it is organized on sound political lines to provide service to the body politic, and that it is governed with sufficient wisdom to enable it to function properly. If it fails in these respects it should not receive legal recognition. Thus the legalization of the trade unions by a Tory Government without insistence on these principles was a blunder in statecraft. Parliament has, in fact, sanctioned industrial organizations of employers and employed, whose sole object is to carry on private war against each other. The evolution of trade unionism on faulty lines was natural enough and is the inevitable outcome of our political system. When the movement started during the Napoleonic wars the plight of the working classes was piteous, and they were without any guidance to enable them to organize on sound lines. While it represented an inarticulate protest against the wholesale destruction of tradition it had no patriotic purpose. Wise leadership would, at the outset, have insisted on guarantees of service and so have established political relations with the body politic, which would in the end have won privileges. It was in such guarantees that the virtue of the old regulations lay. The latter had a double purpose: they guaranteed the character and efficiency of their working members and also secured for them a high standard of living. It is only on the basis of such guarantees that the power to protect can be generated. The founders of trade unionism were too shortsighted and embittered to see that the interests of a class can be secured only by serving the race interests on which every class depends; for service is the source of wealth.

Instead of basing their whole policy on guaranteeing service, the leaders of the unions have been so misguided as to suppose that the strike, or withdrawal of service, in the attempt to paralyse society, would be a successful method of extorting terms. Parliament has been equally misguided in legalizing this particular form of backmail. Of course there is no objection to any number of men refusing to work if they wish to remain idle; and if masters behave unscrupulously and Parliament refuses to insist on the maintenance of proper standards men must use any weapon they can to protect themselves. If, however, this is admitted it compels the admission of the failure of the law to provide adequate protection. For Parliament to stand aside and tell employers and employed to fight out questions involving vital services is the abdication of sovereignty. The one thing that required to be investigated during the coal strike of 1926 was the standard of living necessary for the maintenance of race interests. If the Royal Commission had given a ruling as to wages required for the upkeep of a miner's family there would have been a basis on which the Government could and should have dictated to masters and men. If the public required coal they would have had to pay a price allowing for a proper wage, regardless of competition. There is no inherent necessity to sanction competition. Of course there would be ruinous trouble, but that was bound to come, and is coming in any case, for free trade has produced it, and we cannot avoid the consequences of generations of folly. The desirable standard of life was the first thing to investigate. It required investigation without bias; it was in fact discussed with a pronounced free-trade bias, and by people of various eccentricities. In July, 1925, with a clear conception of the basis of remuneration, the Government could have handled the coal crisis quite simply. If it had been found that the miners were receiving enough they could have been ordered to resume work on pain of being permanently deprived of work or relief in this country. If they were not getting enough the Government's duty was to intervene to protect race interests. For no government can neglect race interests or subscribe to the fatal dictum of Burke that "the impossibility of the subsistence of a man who carries his labour to the market is totally beside the question in his way of viewing it. The only question is what it is worth to the buyer." No government dare admit that, but it was treated as an axiom by the Royal Commission.

Non-intervention on this point was a policy of pure Liberalism, and in the treatment of the coal strike Baldwin is not entitled to call himself a Conservative because he neglected to protect race interests and treated the matter as the sole concern of the piratical organizations of masters and men, to whom he merely offered the services of the Government as a good-natured intermediary. The result is that the men have been forced back to work for wages which may or may not be adequate, and nothing has been settled or decided. All that is known is that in 1925 the miners' wages had risen from seven shillings and ninepence to ten shillings and fourpence since 1914; that is to say, 100 had risen to 133. The cost of living had in the same period risen from 100 to 177, so that the miner's position, none too good before the war, had become deplorable, and he was asked to come down another 20 per cent. At the same time masters and men got out agreed figures which were submitted to the Government showing that the average price of coal at the pithead was 20s. 6d. a ton, while the retail price was 50s. The workers in the middle trades—railway men and dockers—had received rises more than equal to the increased cost of living, and the miners were really being asked to reduce their standards to meet these demands. The Report of the Royal Commission is one of the most eccentric reports ever made to Parliament. The question of the status of the industry is ignored. It does not seem to have occurred to any member of the commission that except in reference to status none of the conclusions could have any practical bearing at all, and that if this question were neglected the report must become a meaningless collection of inconsistencies. The vital question of the character of the control is never referred to. It never occurred to anyone to inquire why men who in peace and war have faced death quite cheerfully should suddenly mutiny and go through months of appalling discomfort merely because wages were too low. There is always more than that behind mutiny—something that men with the middle-class bias never discover: the failure of the character of the control. The report recommended co-operative selling agencies,[1] a suggestion which might be worked out to displace the control of the markets by the moneyed interests. It was so misunderstood by the Government that its working out was entrusted to a politician

[1] See "Chaos in Industry" in the "Nineteenth Century and After," October, 1925, by the Author.

whose race bias had made him one of the pre-war leaders of the defeatists. The report recommended the revival of the multiple shift system, which has been condemned and abandoned on racial grounds. It recommended the maintenance of private property, in the Whig sense, as the basic principle of control, but condemned private property in any shape or form as far as royalties are concerned. The report has of course not contributed to a solution but has merely wasted time and money and allowed further opportunities for the development of Communist activities. The King's Speech in February, 1926, paid lip-service to the principle that the "interests of the nation are paramount," but no effort has been made to compel members of the body politic to conform to it—the only legitimate object of compulsion and the only object for which the Government do *not* apply it.

The warfare between capital and labour, the components of productive industry, is due to political misconception and bad government. The masters' and men's associations are equally piratical and should be disbanded. Until this political action is taken any discussion about economics is premature. The warfare between employers and employed mustcease. Arbitration cannot supply a remedy. The proposal to arbitrate is based on the same fallacy as the strike, implying as it does that there is a conflict of interests to be adjusted. Arbitration is in any case a practical impossibility because no genuine impartial arbitrator with a knowledge of the facts could be found, and if he could be found there is no principle he can apply. Arbitration implies mutual submission to some law. Trade disputes arise from the workmen's objection to remuneration or conditions of labour. *Ex hypothesi*, these are left to free competition and anarchy. Until there is a law there can be no submission, and in consequence no arbitration in labour disputes. When the conditions of industry are regularized and its status is restored it will become possible to propound practical policies. As it is, one proposal will be as bad as another, profit-sharing in any shape or form being the most futile and biased proposition of all. The conditions of industry can all be changed, for man and not destiny has created them. They can be changed by restoring the status of industry so that each service and function is properly related by tradition and law to the body politic. The legal and medical associations are models of political organization modelled on the old city companies. There is not the

smallest difficulty in finding the practical plan for restoring the economic welfare of the race. "It is not hidden from thee, neither is it far off. It is not in heaven, that thou shouldst say, Who shall go up for us to heaven and bring it unto us, that we may hear it and do it? Neither is it beyond the sea, that thou shouldst say, Who shall go over the sea for us, and bring it unto us, that we may hear it and do it? But the word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart, that thou mayst do it." There is only one practical difficulty, and that is to find the motive to do it. With every party and every newspaper determined to block the way there is some difficulty in the path of statecraft. It can, however, be done, and it is going to be done, for the spirit of England is still sufficiently strong to survive the political poison-gas of parliamentarians and pressmen. The statesman must know that all the controversies that have arisen out of labour unrest are but symptoms of anarchy. To discuss the merits of piecework, of combination, or restricted output, of hours of labour, and of various methods of remuneration is futile, until ordered traditions are re-established directed to the achievement of the sound purpose of service. When such a purpose is once whole-heartedly espoused, organization can proceed on sound lines, and thus will industry become identified with all that is greatest and best in the homeland of the English people.

CHAPTER VIII

THE MONEYED INTERESTS

WE have seen that money, representing power to command services and acquire property, should be issued only to those who have performed direct service to the nation, and may be exchanged by them for goods or services. In this way the currency can be a useful adjunct of wealth, subject only to the slightest fluctuations in value. Every one who legitimately acquires money thus issued must have performed an equivalent service. The power that resides in money, its mobility and its quality of making all wealth available, has always made it desirable, and it has become the favourite object of crime. Money being so much easier to dispose of than a pearl necklace or a work of art is the more interesting to those who seek to make a living by force or fraud. Civilized nations soon learn to establish order and provide strong deterrents against crime, and the desire for easy money then stimulates the ingenuity of those who wish to acquire it without performing services or breaking the law. Ruskin [1] has treated the history of the method by which the man, who wished to acquire money without performing any service for it, made or acquired a spade, and lent the spade to another for a consideration ; and in course of time the spade brought in many hundred times its value without any effort on the part of the lender. In this way the principle of hire and hire-purchase arose, and is eventually sanctioned in every legal system. Tradition soon remedies defects, and a man who has spent an exorbitant sum in hiring a spade teaches his son to go and earn enough to buy a spade outright, while hiring remains in vogue for the casual users of spades. Just so, a man who could not afford to keep horses would find it useful to hire post-horses in the emergency of chasing his eloping daughter. Hire for casual requirements or emergencies must always be one of the common contracts. It is probably invariably unsound for all permanent purposes, and certainly contrary to tradition,

[1] "Unto this Last."

and must upset the financial equilibrium of a nation by causing the accumulation of too much power in the hands of non-producers.

The man with the spade well illustrates the age-long economic conflict. A spade is a highly civilized form of the lever, the first artifice by which man supplemented his own physical strength. The spade can stand for the symbol of all machinery. The spade is useless except a service be rendered with it. This involves the expenditure of some brain power and much time and energy. The lazy or incompetent races devote all their intelligence to finding ways of inducing people with the capacity for service to expend their time and energy in service and to part with more or less of the produce of their labour. As producers are not so foolish as to part with the results of their toil for nothing the inferior races come to them offering services. Obviously it is difficult and tiresome to find markets and to exchange goods, and it seems worth while to pay a little to an agent who can do this. The agents of exchange have an essential function to perform for buyers and sellers. The performance of the function puts the agent in an economically powerful position which makes him dangerous when he does not scruple to use it for his own benefit by controlling prices and making an exorbitant middle profit. Lacking all traditions of service, living on the work and needs of others, the middleman quite naturally fails to develop a standard of honour. Profit is made his sole aim and his only standard. If anyone with less reputation than Lord Milner had pointed out that the system produces a moneyed interest which is invariably unpatriotic there would have been no hope of getting a hearing for a proposition which is nevertheless obviously true. All wise systems have controlled the middleman and so have escaped the tyranny of an independent moneyed interest with its indifference to race aims. The principle they have applied is that revived by the Irish Agricultural Organization Society, namely, to deprive the middleman of his independence and to restore the independence of the producer, when the interests of the consumers are automatically secured. To force all producers to accept a system of permanently hiring spades is to subject the nobler races to the parasitic races and eventually to exterminate the former. The contract of hire is desirable for casual requirements only. The profitable principle of hiring animals, machinery, or goods has, by certain nations,

notably the Jews, been extended in its application to money, as if money were an ordinarily marketable commodity. Banks of money are piled up from the surplus earnings of producers and used by bankers to finance industry. As an occasional auxiliary of transactions such loans assist the producer, by enabling him to proceed with his business without waiting for payment while his capital is embarked on a lengthy journey. From the banker's point of view the loan is sound business which means cash in exchange for the legal title to the goods which, if adequately insured, are security for the loan and interest. Whether the purchaser or the vendor or the middleman borrows the whole or part of the loan the interest falls as a charge on productive industry. As prices are reduced to a minimum by competition any additional charge upon production involves an inadequate remuneration for services rendered. It is desirable therefore in the interests of productive industry that loans should be resorted to only in emergencies as the occasional auxiliaries of business. Where the borrowing of money becomes a regular practice it results in the banks taxing all production in the interests of non-producing parties whose membership of the body politic is based upon the performance of very flimsy services in the way of exchange, which could be better performed by agents acting for producers. It is significant that every moral system, except Puritanism, has condemned the taking of interest, and the Old Testament makes the economic reason for the condemnation clear. The objection to usury or interest is based on race considerations, for a Jew is forbidden to take interest from another Jew, but it is regarded, at least by inference, as commendable to take it from aliens whom it will tend to subdue. The contracting of debts as occasional transactions and the granting of credit as a temporary measure are legitimate expedients. A settled policy of debt must result in the ruin of productive industry. The credit on which loans are made is based upon the character of those who produce, and the incidence of every debt, whether private or public, falls upon productive industry. As it is productive industry which has to face the risks due to the elements—for instance, when a good farmer's crops fail in a bad season, relief from this incidence is provided by law, and all systems which permit interest have sooner or later established a bankruptcy law to relieve the unfortunate producers from their liabilities. Wherever legal relief from liability is given

the burden is shifted from one party to another. The law cannot lighten the burden: all it can do is to shift it. With regard to bankruptcy and limited liability there are definite principles by which the legal burden of debt is shifted from the shoulders of the party who intentionally contracted it on to the shoulders of other parties who are compelled involuntarily to assume it. In every case the ultimate responsibility must fall on productive industry, because debts are but liquidated with money; they are discharged by service.

The English law allows a reasonable rate of interest and objects only to such as is harsh and unconscionable. It was not on any principle of equity that the old systems objected to the taking of interest. The objection was based on racial considerations alone, and on recognition of the fact that the practice was injurious to the interests of producers. It mattered not if the rate of interest were high or low, for the taking of interest had the same tendency in any event. On this point there is unanimity throughout history until Puritan times. The Puritan alone approves of interest, and has established a system which is unworkable without it. The statesman can do something to modify the system though it would be difficult to introduce the principle of responsibility of shareholders. He might, however, introduce a provision that no company should henceforth be formed unless its directors were substantial people who would accept full financial responsibility, so that a company could not go into liquidation without involving the personal bankruptcy of its directors. As a captain goes down with his ship, so a director should go down with his company. This would in a measure protect productive industry and greatly improve the nation's credit. As the law stands any irresponsible person can form a company and contract debts without any hope of paying them, and he can go on doing this as often as he pleases, thus getting all the profits out of successful concerns and avoiding all the losses.

A treatise on debt, interest, and limited liability is urgently required. Interesting as it would be from the point of view of private morals and economics, it would have its most important bearings on public debts and their effect on race interests. It is the vital concern of the statesmen to know precisely what a nation is doing when it *borrows* its own money from its own citizens. The institution of a national

debt means that at a certain time part of the national resources are utilized for a war or some other purpose. Instead of confiscating the required resources, which would involve depriving some people of their property and not others, the Government levies taxes as equitably as possible, and with the proceeds buys and pays for what it wants. When the limit of taxation is reached it invites all who still possess accumulated wealth to lend that wealth to the Government and promises to pay interest until repayment. The result is that those who have nothing to lend find themselves saddled, in addition to their own share of taxation, with the further burden of repaying those who made the loans. During the Napoleonic wars the nation found all the resources required to carry war to a successful conclusion. If the war had been carried on without debt every one would have been equally impoverished. By a modern innovation the war was financed by loans, and the soldiers who performed the greatest services, on return to civil life, were taxed to repay the money that provided their equipment. Nor are they merely taxed the actual cost of the war, but in addition they and their descendants must pay the whole cost over and over again every twenty years. Such taxes are enough to annihilate the serving sections of the community. Yet the policy of debt has been deliberately selected from among alternative methods of finance. Even if, in the Great War, debt had been the most effective method of meeting national emergencies, it was deliberately increased by the invention of theories and policies to justify expenditure. For instance, two thousand millions went in increased wages and war bonuses to people who were performing far less onerous duties than the soldier on his meagre pay. Lloyd George simply played with war, as he had played at social reform, in order to increase the National Debt.

The classic passage in which Disraeli exposed the tendency of this policy is the statesman's guide.

> "If it be a salutary principle in the investigation of historical transactions, to be careful in discriminating the cause from the pretext, there is scarcely any instance in which the application of this principle is more fertile in results than in that of the Dutch invasion of 1688. The real cause of this invasion was financial. The Prince of Orange had found that the resources of Holland, however

considerable, were inadequate to sustain him in his internecine rivalry with the great sovereign of France. In an authentic conversation which has descended to us, held by William at the Hague with one of the prime abettors of the invasion, the prince did not disguise his motives; he said, 'Nothing but such a constitution as you have in England can have the credit that is necessary to raise such sums as a great war requires.' The Prince came, and used our constitution for his purpose; he introduced into England the system of Dutch finance. The principle of that system was to mortgage industry in order to protect property: abstractedly nothing can be conceived more unjust; its practice in England has been equally injurious. In Holland, with a small population engaged in the same pursuits, in fact a nation of bankers, the system was adapted to the circumstances which had created it. All shared in the present spoil, and therefore, could endure the future burden. And so to this day Holland is sustained, almost solely sustained, by the vast capital thus created which still lingers among its dykes. But applied to a country in which the circumstances were entirely different; to a considerable and rapidly increasing population, where there was a numerous peasantry, a trading middle class struggling into existence—the system of Dutch finance, pursued more or less for nearly a century and a half, has ended in the degradation of a fettered and burthened multitude. Nor have the demoralizing consequences of the funding system on the more favoured classes been less decided. It has made debt a national habit; it has made credit the ruling power, not the exceptional auxiliary of all transactions; it has introduced a loose, inexact, haphazard and dishonest spirit in the conduct of both public and private life; a spirit dazzling and yet dastardly; reckless of consequences and yet shrinking from responsibility. And in the end it has so over-stimulated the energies of the population to maintain the material engagements of the State, and of society at large, that the moral condition of the people has been entirely lost sight of."

Curiously enough, the most statesmanlike and conservative view of the National Debt is contained in Pethick Lawrence's chapter in the Labour Party book. Mr. Lawrence sees eye to eye with Disraeli in the matter, though his conclusions

with regard to a graduated capital levy are a departure from principle and erroneous. Mr. Lawrence correctly points out that in 1914 to 1918 no necessity arose out of the situation created by war to increase the National Debt. That his argument is sound has been proved by Germany, who nominally lost the war but abolished her debt. The fact that the bankers advised on national finance is enough to indicate that the policy was eccentric. That does not imply that the advice was dishonest; but it does imply that it was biased. Just before the last Balkan war the principal European bankers advised their respective governments that there could be no war, as Bulgaria and Turkey were without funds. The belligerents were, however, neither deterred nor dismayed. Though more troops were employed and operations were on a bigger scale than in any previous war in history military operations proceeded to their conclusion without either party being in the slightest degree embarrassed by the state of their finances or the theories of the bankers. Similarly, in August 1914, the bankers gave honest but erroneous advice to Asquith's administration to the effect that Germany must collapse by the following October on account of the state of her finances. The first prediction being proved erroneous by events, it was followed by equally absurd forecasts as to Germany's financial prostration by Christmas or the following April. The tragedy due to following this advice would have been greater than it actually was had there not been a statesman in the Cabinet to counteract the bias of the financiers. Fortunately Kitchener appreciated the real facts and from the start prepared for a long war. Germany was never embarrassed, and has since the war not only got rid of her national debts but has paid off her private internal mortgages as well.

From the biased standpoint of the moneyed interests debt is highly desirable. It enables them to tax productive industry permanently for the benefit of a small class of irresponsible non-producers, whose enormous accumulations are invested in a mortgage on the nation's industry. This tax has been very adroitly increased since 1925 by the restoration of the gold standard. There is no doubt about the wisdom of restoring the gold standard, in spite of the disagreeable consequences of deflation. The gold standard cannot maintain the internal purchasing power of money, which fluctuates according to the service it represents. For

instance, there was a gold standard from 1901 to 1912, and yet money fell in value so that 17s. in 1901 would purchase as much as 20s. in 1912. The maintenance of a gold standard of currency means that money as far as international exchange is involved has a fixed and definite relation to its denomination, and sixpence has the same value this week as it had last. That is in itself desirable, and Professor Gustav Cassel rightly says that "the opponents of the restoration of the Gold Standard—whatever the theoretical merits of their arguments may have been—have rendered their country bad service by causing public opinion to hold the Gold Standard responsible for evils which have nothing to do with the monetary system of the country." [1] There was nothing wrong in the policy of deflation in itself. The objection to it lay in the consequent appreciation of money in view of the nation's indebtedness. The War Loan was borrowed when the pound sterling was much depreciated in value, and before restoring its value some arrangement should have been made for settling the debt on a par with the amount actually borrowed. The bankers and moneyed interests generally, who are big holders of War Loan, made a huge profit by the restoration of the gold standard, with the consequence that though the debt had been partially repaid in the meantime, its burden was actually greater in 1926 than it was in 1920.

A similar financial trick was played on the Colony of Kenya in 1920. The rupee at 1s. 4d. was replaced by the florin at 2s., with the result that most of the productive interests fell into the hands of the banks.

When we speak of a nation's debt amounting to so many thousands of millions of pounds we use expressions which convey no meaning that any mind has the capacity to appreciate. It is doubtful whether without some symbol or elaborate illustration anyone can get a mental grasp of the significance of figures denoting a single million. Such a figure staggers the intellect of all but trained mathematicians, and it may surprise many people to realize that there have been less than a million days since the birth of Christ—only, in fact, a little more than seven hundred thousand. Instead of using ciphers which convey no comprehensive meaning, a preferable method of appreciating the meaning of debt is to look upon the nation as being composed of those responsible citizens who can alone shoulder the burden, and to divide the

[1] "The Times."

total amount of the national liabilities so as to ascertain the amount of debt for which each individual would be responsible if he were called upon to liquidate his equitable share of the whole. While absolute accuracy in such a calculation is hardly to be expected, it is approximately correct to say that on such a basis every Englishman would be saddled with a debt of two thousand pounds. If, therefore, the burden of debt were equitably distributed and taxation were equally levied, every taxable citizen would have to find enough to pay off £2,000, plus annual interest thereon in addition, until it was paid off. It goes without saying that taxation is never equally levied, though every true patriot must desire that he should be taxed up to the full share of his responsibilities. To appreciate the real absurdity of a national debt it is necessary to imagine that taxation is as equitable as possible and that every citizen is liable for the service of £2,000 of indebtedness. Supposing now that Government securities were held in exactly equal amounts by these same taxpayers, it is obvious that each would be paying enough to repay himself with interest, plus an amount in proportion to his share of official salaries and the expenses incidental to issuing the loans and collecting the taxes. Thus by a costly process, involving the maintenance of hordes of officials, each individual would lose on his investment. This absolute equilibrium of investment and liability, resulting in dead loss to every one except the officials employed, is the best result that could arise in ideal circumstances, so far as the investor of £2,000 or less is concerned. In practice, the position cannot possibly approximate to this. Investments are not made in equal amounts equivalent to the units of population. Some persons make large investments, some make small investments, and some make none at all. The ratio of income to taxation, therefore, differs in each individual case; and while all who invest £2,000 or less are taxed more than they receive, those who invest more than £2000 receive more than the amount of the taxes they pay in respect of the service of the National Debt. It is therefore apparent that the interest received by small investors is not really income, but merely creates an illusion of income, and such small investors—every one who holds £2,000 of Government stock or any less amount—and all who do not invest are taxed to pay interest to all who invest more than £2,000. A "national" debt therefore means the debt of the poorer part of the population

and all who do not invest in Government securities to those who do invest. Since the big holders of War Loan are the moneyed interests who by means of funded loans draw a permanent income from productive industry—on which the incidence of all taxation must ultimately fall—the policy of debt is manifestly the most eccentric factor in English politics.

The maintenance and steady growth of permanent debt is essential to the modern system of banking.[1] That system is the result of the destruction of the institution of private property. The banks have not, indeed, been nationalized, but a worse process has affected them. The amalgamation of banks has resulted in their being internationalized. Their policy has no relationship to race interests, as had the private banks, whose existence depended on correct estimates and cultivation of character. Banks are the arteries through which credit and currency flow for the economic nourishment of the body politic. The basis of credit is the character of the borrower and his knowledge of his craft,[2] as well as his energy and capacity for work. Such qualities were the securities, and, as a rule, the only securities, on which responsible private bankers made advances. Having unlimited responsibility, the banker had every inducement to know the character of the man whom he trusted, and so race interests were served by the encouragement of competent people.

To find a bank working on the sound old lines of credit, it is necessary to go to America and study the methods of Pierpont Morgan. In English banks there is now no personal responsibility, no personal connexion or relationship between banker and customer, no knowledge of or regard for the

[1] There is a prevalent belief that we have been reducing debt since the war. In fact, however, there was an increase of £181,000,000 between April, 1919, and March, 1926. See "The Times," February 1, 1927.

[2] The following is an extract from the late Mr. Morgan's evidence before the Pujo Commission in 1913:

Question: Is not commercial credit based primarily upon money or property?

Mr. Morgan: No, sir; the first thing is character.

Question: Before money or property?

Mr. Morgan: Before money or anything else. Money cannot buy it.

Question: So that a man with character without anything behind it can get all the credit he wants, and a man with property cannot get it?

Mr. Morgan: That is the rule of business, sir.

. . . . . .

Question: Do you think they ever look at the name? Do you think that the banks ever look at anything but the collateral?

Mr. Morgan: I do not know what the banks do. I know I do.

character of borrowers or the objects of the loans. In consequence, race interests are not served, and the country has no proper banking system, and has not had since the banks were taken out of private hands and centralized to such an extent as to abolish the vital elements of private property and enterprise. The method now is to lend on security, which amounts to lending to anyone regardless of his character, his competence, or the object of the loan. The banker requires in every case a mortgage of race interests—some security that is regarded as valid on the Stock Exchange —to guarantee the loan. Ultimately the security must be a mortgage of race interests. Apart from the consideration that such methods encourage people who lack personal credit and character, it creates a demand for constant increase in the quantity of gilt-edged securities available for pledging to the banks. The abolition of the National Debt—a matter within the range and capacity of sound statesmanship—would involve the destruction of our cosmopolitan banking system and the restoration of national banks under private control. The existing system is dependent on the steady increase of debt. The policy cannot be altered and the debt cannot be reduced without reforming the banking system; and any politician who imagines that it can is a fool. It is in this, as in all other questions of politics, premature to discuss a policy of debt reduction and bank reform until the determination to abolish debt is conceived, for only in the light of such determination can a practical policy be propounded.

PART V

THE NURTURE OF THOUGHT

"A Prince ought to show himself a patron of ability and to honour the proficient in every art."—MACHIAVELLI.

THIS book aims at illustrating the proposition that *purpose moulds policy*, which is the fundamental axiom of statecraft and the basis of political philosophy. Every race requires a priesthood to guard its purpose and an aristocracy to propound its policies and give it hope. Both are dependent on the function of thought. A nation without sound thinkers to guide its destinies must lose its traditions, and decay. The party in English politics which should have conserved tradition has, since it fell under the domination of the Cecils, failed to encourage, or even to recognize, genius. Royalty since its repression by the Whigs and Liberals has had no thinkers in its service, and the aristocracy seem to have forgotten that the nurture of thought is as necessary to them as their daily bread. The consequence is that the mightiest of powers has, in less than thirty years, fallen from the pinnacle of success, if not to complete bankruptcy yet to the paralysis caused by crushing and endless debt.

Patronage of genius is essential to statecraft, and the capacity for it is one of the most becoming features of a true aristocrat. The spread of democracy is due to arrogant disregard of this duty. It has been forgotten that the traditional method of government has certain conditions attaching to it. A governing class is not necessarily, nor even frequently, a body founded on its own intellectual supremacy. Its virtues and powers lie in valour, force of character, decision, and tenacity, in judgment of human quality, love of human nature. There may be even a measure of carelessness concerning mere wealth or mere brains. Practical statesmen must therefore have to support them a class devoted to intellectual pursuits, whose duty it is to think, invent, and harmonize. No traditional system of government has ever existed without this class as an integral

part of it. The Egyptians had their famous priesthood; with the kshatriya went the Brahmin; with the Persian, the Magian; with the feudal lord the mediaeval Churchman. Even the eighteenth-century squire had his family lawyer to advise him. The rule is invariable and absolute. Wherever a fighting and governing class is specialized, there side by side will be found the thinking class. The endowment of religious houses in the Middle Ages had a beneficial result that has been imperfectly appreciated. A desire to promote religion was no doubt the main purpose; but religion then meant more than it does now, and included the study of language and the arts and sciences. It provided opportunity for original thought. Thus the Church became the organized intellectual class, co-operating with the aristocracy, which was an organized and governing class. By the endowment of religion intelligence was also endowed. The men who gave lands and money to the Church believed that they acquired merit in the sight of God, but they expected such gifts to bring forth worldly results in the shape of books, ideas, and knowledge, useful policies of statecraft, sound principles of administration, and wise maxims of government and conduct.

In their expectations the patrons were not at fault, for churchmen became the leading statesmen of the age. Lanfranc, Gregory VII, Suger, Wolsey, and a hundred others of great eminence were not soldiers, but provided soldiers with invaluable advice. The endowment of religion produced the fullest, keenest, and most searching type of intellectual life, which was the inspiration of the rulers of the age.

Every man of the dominating type whose will has left its mark on history has known the value of men of thought and imagination. Charles the Great, for instance, surrounded himself with scholars and thinkers and gave every encouragement to learning. These patrons were wise in that they did not dictate to their thinkers, and hence men who grew up in such circumstances were not *intellectuals* of the modern type, that is to say, they were free from the vice which springs from using only the logical or ratiocinative part of the mind. On the contrary, they used the whole range of human reason —not only logic, but tradition, instinct, imagination, and discipline—to discover the laws of life and power.

High intelligence is a delicate thing, and it vanishes if not protected. France cannot hope to find a Suger to lead her

now, for Suger's influence was due to the protection of Louis the Fat. It was one of the first objects of democracy to abolish the endowment of intellect and to destroy the Church as a leisured and meditative body. If ordered society is to be saved there must be a revival of patronage and an alteration of present conditions in which writers must please the newspapers or perish. Ever since 1880 sound ideas of aristocracy and Conservatism have appeared all over the Continent. It is not true to say that they have not appeared in England. In England alone they have found no patronage and they have been boycotted by the Press. There have indeed been movements as well as thought, but they have appealed in vain to biased and vicious standards of taste. Of all the movements in Europe nothing has been more astonishing than the claim of the most enlightened and powerful of English trade unions to class privileges and hereditary rights on the ground that these are necessary for more efficient service. From the stronghold of socialism came the heralds of caste, to find themselves ignored by the Press and snubbed by the aristocracy. The fundamental stirrings of national spirit lack intellectual leadership, not because such leadership is not available, but because it is crushed and starved.

INDEX

Action, 17
  principles of, 17, 22, 24
Adam Smith, 52
Agincourt, physique at, 22
Agriculture, test of, 40
American individualism, 6
Arbitration futile in industry, 126
Aristocracy, 15, 66

Baldwin, 27, 87
Banking, 55, 137
Bar Council, 32
Bentham, 52
Benn, Sir Ernest, 94
Bias, 84
  of lawyers, 35, 36
  of morality, 88
  of Press, 88
Blackstone, ix, 46
Body politic, 9
Bolingbroke, 45
Breed, 14
  consistency of, 16
  continuity secured, 40
  distinctions of, 16
  in House of Lords, 17
  mixed, 16

Canals, 48
Capital, 53
Capitalist, Confessions of, 94
Charity, 47
Cheshire, 36
Children's Act, 91
Christianity, 73, 101
Churchill, Randolph, 27
Classes, 66
Communal ownership, 38
Compromise, 25
  at the Restoration, 45
  composition for services, 46
Confiscation, 41
Conquest, object of, 69
Conservatism, definition of, 13
Council of Carthage, 44
Crafts, how controlled, 40
Cree, Crawford, 114
Crown:
  policy of, 67
  suppression of, 67
Cunningham, 52
Customs, 12

Dangers of a debtless community, 57
Death duties, folly of, 3
Debt, 131
Decentralization:
  through family, 38
  through property, 38
Degeneracy, cause of, 2
Demand and supply, 96
Democracy, what it means, 113
Diet, 22
  effect of, 22
Disraeli, 10, 23, 28, 51, 57, 82, 132
Doles, 119
Drink, 90
Droit, 63
Droit du Seigneur, 44
Dutch finance, 133

Eccentricity, 85
Economics:
  definition of, 51
  secret of, 51
  the real issue, 95
Emotions, basis of, 2
Englishman's house, 38
Enjoyment, not an object of law, 37
Ethics of rebellion, 77
Exchange, Benn's view of, 95
Exploitation, 34
  effect of, 21
Ex-service man, 30

Fabian Society, 98
Faguet, 43
Faith, parent of hope, 18
Feudal conception of property, 35

Feudal laws, 35
  object of, 36
Feudalism:
  horizontal divisions, 42
  perpendicular divisions, 42
  what it was, 40, 49
Fine and imprisonment, 78
Fleas, 86
Food and honour, 4
  and woman, 2
Forfeiture, 40, 41
  distinct from confiscation, 41
Franchise, 67
Freeman, 38

General Medical Council, 32
German imperialism, 72
Gilds, 40
Gladstone, 36
Gold standard, 54, 134
Government:
  secret of, 24
  two methods of, 26

Habits, 12
Hall Caine, 39
Harrying of the North, 25, 64
Henry VIII, 21, 46
Hereditary principle, 14
History:
  dearth of, 9
  function of, 12
Hobhouse on equality, 116
House of Lords, 4, 17
House property, 38
Hunger and social virtue, 2

Illusions:
  of individualism, 93
  of socialism, 98
Imperialism, 47, 69
  Roman and English, 70
Index of anarchy, 77
Individualism, 93
  illusions of, 93
  not represented, 25
  what it is, 44
Industry, 105
Insobriety, 90
Inspectors, 89, 115
Instincts, 12
Interest, 130
International influences, 33

Irish Agricultural Organization Society, 57, 129

Judges, incapacity in politics, 42
Jury, trial by, 78
Jus primæ noctis, 44
Jus spatiandi, 37
Juvenal, 107

Keynes, Mr., eccentricity of, 87
Kingship, 62
  function of, 81
  reduced to a pageant, 82
Kultur, 73

Labour market, 47
  unrest, 48, 49, 113, 116
Laissez-faire, 47
Land, 36
  administration of, 36
  drainage of, 48
  hereditary holding, 36
  object of cultivation, 36
  private property in, 36
Laws, 12, 78
Law Society, 32
Lawyers, 35
  bias of, 35, 36
  influence of, 45
Leader, temperament of, 30
Legislation:
  method since 1689, 27
  principle of, 27, 80
Lending, prevalence of, 55
Liberalism, 65
Life, insurance, 48
  object of, 1
Limited liability, 49
  in tort, 110
Lloyd George, 27
Locke, 38, 88
Loyalty, basis of, 82
Ludovici, 5, 14, 19, 46

Magna Charta, 77
Maine, 13, 117
Maitland, xii, 26, 38, 46
Manor, 38
Marx, Karl, 52
Masterman, 104, 113, 116
Mating, importance of, 16
Memory:
  dependence of life on, 12
  secret of, 9

Mesopotamia, report on expedition, 64
Middlemen, 129
Mill, J. S., 52
Milner, xiii, 56, 129,
Missionaries, 72
Money, 54, 128
  issue of, 54
Money-making, 3
Moneyed interests, 128
  hostile to productive industry, 56
  how extensive, 48
  Milner's view of, xi, 56
Morality, varies with class, 78, 104
Mystery, 32

National Debt, 132
  Insurance, 117
Nationalism, 59
Naval discipline, 20
Nietzsche, 43
Norman Conquest, 39, 60
Nurture of thought, 139

Oath of Salisbury, 64
Object of life, 1
Oligarchy, 66
Opinion, value of, 24
Order:
  how maintained, 44
  love of, 70
Organization, secret of, 32
Ownership, definition of, 38

Party politics, 109
Patria potestas, 37, 38
Patriotism, 30
Pay, 30, 47
Peace, 38
Personal nexus, 40
Physique:
  of English, 22
  effect of diet, 22
Pitt Rivers, 19, 20, 71, 72
Police, 88
Policy:
  consistency inevitable, 26
  how far end justifies means, 2
  motive of, 1
Political organization, 32
Politics, xi
  an art, 25, 29
  a science, 25, 29
Poor law, 47
Power, secret of, 29
Prices, 56
Primogeniture, 62, 75
Principle in art and politics, 1, 25
Private peace, 38
Private property, 38
  political basis of, 41
Profit:
  and loss, 4
  a test of finance, 96
  sharing, why impracticable, 49
Progress, definition of, 13
Prohibitions, 13
  feminine, 7
Property:
  definition of, 35
  English conception of, 35
  feudal conception of, 35
  land and movables, 52
  real and personal, 52
  secret of, 35
Puritanism, 88, 101, 103
Purpose, 1
  moulds policy, 1, 17, 21, 23, 24

Quality, standards of, 47

Race, xii
  definition of, 18
  English, 19
  Jewish, 19
  secret of, 16
Ramsay MacDonald, 27
Rank, value of, 62
Real property, 39
Rebellion, ethics of, 77
Red Rose tradition, 65
Religion, principle of toleration, 51, 101
Revolt against regulation, 43
Revolution, prospect of, 99
Reward, 30
Reynolds, Stephen, 91, 106
Right, 63
  Blackstone's use of, 46
  definition of, 37
  of asylum, 61
Roman conception of property, 37

Roman law, 37
  contrast with English, 37
  influence of, 46, 62
Ruskin, 52, 128

Science, limitations of, 14
Secrets:
  lost, 9
  of economics, 51
  of government, 24
  of memory, 9
  of organization, 32
  of power, 29
  of property, 35
  of race, 16
Sera, Leo G., 106
Service, 63
  composition for, 46
  regulation of, 40
  sanction of, 41
  test of, 40
  to body politic, 32
  traditions of, 20
Settled Land Acts, 48
Shop-window temperament, 43
Sloane, Miss, 104, 105
Sobriety, 105
Social affection, 30, 42
Socialism, 98
  illusions of, 98
Social reform, 108
Sovereignty, delegated, 40, 42
Specialization, 32, 84
Spencer, Herbert, 84, 85
State, 9, 48
  socialism, 98
Statesmen, 35
Status, 32
  progress to contract, 13, 33, 117
Statute of Uses, 45
Stratford, Wingfield, 70
Strikes, 124
Sweating prevented, 40
Symbolism, use of, 93

Tacitus, 38
Taste, standards of, 3, 34
Taxation, direct, 46
Tenure, 38
Test of good agriculture, 40
Thrift, 105
Tort, limited liability in, 110
Toryism, 43, 65
Trade:
  importance of, 70
  prejudice against, 4
Trade union, 122
Trades Disputes Act, 110
Truck Act, 11, 118
Tyranny, 48, 49

Unanimity:
  in English politics, 25
  in religion, 26
Undercutting prevented, 40
Unemployment, 47
Unfair competition prevented, 40
Uses, Statute of, 45

Vernon, Dr., 86
Virtues, 105

Wages, 47, 117
War, 61
  school of love, 2
Wealth:
  and creative faculty, 3
  Benn's definition, 95
  masculine attitude, 3
Whiggery, 43, 65
White Rose tradition, 65
Willoughby de Broke, v
Woman and food, 2
Working-class morality, 104

Young England Party, 43

Printed by Jarrold & Sons Ltd. Norwich

METHUEN'S GENERAL LITERATURE

A SELECTION OF

MESSRS. METHUEN'S PUBLICATIONS

This Catalogue contains only a selection of the more important books published by Messrs. Methuen. A complete catalogue of their publications may be obtained on application.

PART I. GENERAL LITERATURE

Allen (R. Wilberforce)
METHODISM AND MODERN WORLD PROBLEMS. *Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.*

Bain (F. W.)
A DIGIT OF THE MOON. THE DESCENT OF THE SUN. A HEIFER OF THE DAWN. IN THE GREAT GOD'S HAIR. A DRAUGHT OF THE BLUE. AN ESSENCE OF THE DUSK. AN INCARNATION OF THE SNOW. A MINE OF FAULTS. THE ASHES OF A GOD. BUBBLES OF THE FOAM. A SYRUP OF THE BEES. THE LIVERY OF EVE. THE SUBSTANCE OF A DREAM. *All Fcap. 8vo. 5s. net.* AN ECHO OF THE SPHERES. *Wide Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.*

Balfour (Sir Graham)
THE LIFE OF ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON. *Twentieth Edition. In one Volume. Cr. 8vo. Buckram, 7s. 6d. net.*

Barker (Ernest)
NATIONAL CHARACTER. *Demy 8vo. 12s. 6d. net.*

Belfield (Reginald)
FROM LANDSCAPE TO STUDIO. Illustrated. *Fcap. 4to. 12s. 6d. net.*

Belloc (Hilaire)
PARIS. THE PYRENEES. *Each 8s. 6d. net.* ON NOTHING. HILLS AND THE SEA. ON SOMETHING. FIRST AND LAST. THIS AND THAT AND THE OTHER. ON. ON EVERYTHING. ON ANYTHING. EMMANUEL BURDEN. *Each 3s. 6d. net.* MARIE ANTOINETTE. *18s. net.* A HISTORY OF ENGLAND. In 4 vols. Vols. I and II. *15s. net each.*

Birmingham (George A.)
A WAYFARER IN HUNGARY. Illustrated. *8s. 6d. net.* A WAYFARER IN IRELAND. Illustrated. *7s. 6d. net.* SPILLIKINS: a Book of Essays. *5s. net.* SHIPS AND SEALING WAX: a Book of Essays. *5s. net.*

Bowles (George F. S.)
THE STRENGTH OF ENGLAND. *Demy 8vo. 8s. 6d. net.*

Bryden (H. A.)
HORN AND HOUND: Memories of Hunting. Illustrated. *Demy 8vo. 15s. net.*

Bulley (M. H.)
ART AND COUNTERFEIT. Illustrated. 15s. *net.* ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL ART: A SHORT HISTORY. *Second Edition, Revised. Crown* 8vo. 10s. 6d. *net.*

Burns (Robert)
THE POEMS AND SONGS. Edited by ANDREW LANG. *Fourth Edition. Wide Demy* 8vo. 10s. 6d. *net.*

Chandler (Arthur), D.D.
ARA CŒLI 5s. *net.* FAITH AND EXPERIENCE. 5s. *net.* THE CULT OF THE PASSING MOMENT. 6s. *net.* THE ENGLISH CHURCH AND REUNION. 5s. *net.* SCALA MUNDI. 4s. 6d. *net.*

Chesterton (G. K.)
THE BALLAD OF THE WHITE HORSE. ALL THINGS CONSIDERED. TREMENDOUS TRIFLES. FANCIES VERSUS FADS. CHARLES DICKENS. *Each Fcap.* 8vo. 3s. 6d. *net.* ALARMS AND DISCURSIONS. A MISCELLANY OF MEN. THE USES OF DIVERSITY. THE OUTLINE OF SANITY. *Each Fcap.* 8vo. 6s. *net.* A GLEAMING COHORT. *Fcap.* 8vo. 2s. 6d. *net.* WINE, WATER, AND SONG. *Fcap.* 8vo. 1s. 6d. *net.*

Clutton-Brock (A.)
WHAT IS THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN? ESSAYS ON ART. SHAKESPEARE'S HAMLET. *Each* 5s. *net.* ESSAYS ON BOOKS. MORE ESSAYS ON BOOKS. ESSAYS ON LIFE. ESSAYS ON RELIGION. ESSAYS ON LITERATURE AND LIFE. *Each* 6s. *net.* SHELLEY, THE MAN AND THE POET. 7s. 6d. *net.*

Cowling (George H.)
A PREFACE TO SHAKESPEARE. Illustrated. 5s. *net.* CHAUCER. Illustrated. 6s. *net.*

Crawley (Ernest)
THE MYSTIC ROSE. Revised and Enlarged by THEODORE BESTERMAN. Two Vols. *Demy* 8vo. £1 10s. *net.*

Cromer (Countess of)
LAMURIAC and other Sketches. *Small Demy* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

Dolls' House (The Queen's)
THE BOOK OF THE QUEEN'S DOLLS' HOUSE. Vol. I. THE HOUSE, Edited by A. C. BENSON, C.V.O., and Sir LAWRENCE WEAVER, K.B.E. Vol. II. THE LIBRARY, Edited by E. V. LUCAS. Profusely Illustrated. A Limited Edition. *Crown* 4to. £6 6s. *net.*
EVERYBODY'S BOOK OF THE QUEEN'S DOLLS' HOUSE. An abridged edition of the above. Illustrated. *Crown* 4to. 5s. *net.*

Edwardes (Tickner)
THE LORE OF THE HONEYBEE. *Thirteenth Edition.* 7s. 6d. *net.* BEEKEEPING FOR ALL. 3s. 6d. *net.* THE BEE-MASTER OF WARRILOW. *Third Edition.* 7s. 6d. *net.* All Illustrated. BEE-KEEPING DO'S AND DON'TS. 2s. 6d. *net.*

Einstein (Albert)
RELATIVITY: THE SPECIAL AND GENERAL THEORY. 5s. *net.* SIDELIGHTS ON RELATIVITY. 3s. 6d. *net.* THE MEANING OF RELATIVITY. 5s. *net.* THE BROWNIAN MOVEMENT. 5s. *net.* *Other books on the Einstein Theory.* AN INTRODUCTION TO THE THEORY OF RELATIVITY. By LYNDON BOLTON. 5s. *net.*
THE PRINCIPLE OF RELATIVITY. By A. EINSTEIN, H. A. LORENTZ, H. MINKOWSKI and H. WEYL. With Notes by A. SOMMERFELD. 12s. 6d. *net.*
Write for Complete List

Erman (Adolph)
THE LITERATURE OF THE ANCIENT EGYPTIANS. Translated by Dr. A. M. BLACKMAN. *Demy* 8vo. £1 1s. *net.*

Fouquet (Jean)
THE LIFE OF CHRIST AND HIS MOTHER. From Fouquet's "Book of Hours." Edited by FLORENCE HEYWOOD, B.A. With 24 Plates in Colours. *Wide Royal* 8vo. £3 3s *net.*

Fyleman (Rose)
FAIRIES AND CHIMNEYS. THE FAIRY GREEN. THE FAIRY FLUTE. THE RAINBOW CAT. EIGHT LITTLE PLAYS FOR CHILDREN. FORTY GOOD-NIGHT TALES. FAIRIES AND FRIENDS. THE ADVENTURE CLUB. FORTY GOOD-MORNING TALES. *Each* 3s. 6d. *net.* A SMALL CRUSE. 4s. 6d. *net.* THE ROSE FYLEMAN FAIRY BOOK. Illustrated. 10s. 6d. *net.* LETTY. Illustrated. 6s. *net.* A LITTLE CHRISTMAS BOOK. Illustrated. 2s. *net.*

Gibbon (Edward)
THE DECLINE AND FALL OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE. With Notes, Appendixes, and Maps, by J. B. BURY. Illustrated. Seven volumes. *Demy* 8vo. 15s. *net* each volume. Also, unillustrated. *Crown* 8vo. 7s. 6d. *net* each volume.

Glover (T. R.)
THE CONFLICT OF RELIGIONS IN THE EARLY ROMAN EMPIRE. POETS AND PURITANS. VIRGIL. *Each* 10s. 6d. *net.* FROM PERICLES TO PHILIP. 12s. 6d. *net.*

Graham (Harry)
THE WORLD WE LAUGH IN: More Deportmental Ditties. Illustrated by "FISH." *Sixth Edition. Fcap.* 8vo. 5s. *net.* STRAINED RELATIONS. Illustrated by H. STUART MENZIES and HENDY. *Royal* 16mo. 6s. *net.*

Grahame (Kenneth)
THE WIND IN THE WILLOWS. *Nineteenth Edition. Crown* 8vo. 7s. 6d. *net.* Also, Illustrated by NANCY BARNHART. *Small* 4to. 10s. 6d. *net.* Also unillustrated. *Fcap.* 8vo. 3s. 6d. *net.*

Hadfield (J. A.)
PSYCHOLOGY AND MORALS. *Sixth Edition. Crown* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

Hall (H. R.)
THE ANCIENT HISTORY OF THE NEAR EAST. *Sixth Edition, Revised. Demy* 8vo. £1 1s. *net.* THE CIVILIZATION OF GREECE IN THE BRONZE AGE. Illustrated. *Wide Royal* 8vo. £1 10s. *net.*

Hamer (Sir W. H.), and Hutt (C. W.)
A MANUAL OF HYGIENE. Illustrated. *Demy* 8vo. £1 10s. *net.*

Hewlett (Maurice)
THE LETTERS OF MAURICE HEWLETT. Edited by LAURENCE BINYON. Illustrated. *Demy* 8vo. 18s. *net.*

Hind (A. M.)
A CATALOGUE OF REMBRANDT'S ETCHINGS. Two Vols. Profusely Illustrated. *Wide Royal* 8vo. £1 15s. *net.*

Holdsworth (W. S.)
A HISTORY OF ENGLISH LAW. Nine Volumes. *Demy* 8vo. £1 5s. *net each.*

Hudson (W. H.)
A SHEPHERD'S LIFE. Illustrated. *Demy* 8vo. 10s. 6d. *net.* Also, unillustrated. *Fcap.* 8vo. 3s. 6d. *net.*

Hutton (Edward)
CITIES OF SICILY. Illustrated. 10s. 6d. *net.* MILAN AND LOMBARDY. THE CITIES OF ROMAGNA AND THE MARCHES. SIENA AND SOUTHERN TUSCANY. VENICE AND VENETIA. THE CITIES OF SPAIN. NAPLES AND SOUTHERN ITALY. Illustrated. *Each,* 8s. 6d. *net.* A WAYFARER IN UNKNOWN TUSCANY. THE CITIES OF UMBRIA. COUNTRY WALKS ABOUT FLORENCE. ROME. FLORENCE AND NORTHERN TUSCANY. Illustrated. *Each,* 7s. 6d. *net.*

Imms (A. D.)
A GENERAL TEXTBOOK OF ENTOMOLOGY. Illustrated. *Royal* 8vo. £1 16s. *net.*

Inge (W. R.), D.D., Dean of St. Paul's
CHRISTIAN MYSTICISM. (The Bampton Lectures of 1899.) *Sixth Edition. Crown* 8vo. 7s. 6d. *net.*

Jackson (H. C.)
OSMAN DIGNA. *Demy* 8vo. 12s. 6d. *net.*

Kipling (Rudyard)
BARRACK-ROOM BALLADS. 241*st Thousand.*

THE SEVEN SEAS. 180*th Thousand.*

THE FIVE NATIONS. 130*th Thousand.*

DEPARTMENTAL DITTIES. 111*th Thousand.*

THE YEARS BETWEEN. 95*th Thousand.* Four Editions of these famous volumes of poems are now published, viz.:— *Crown* 8vo. *Buckram,* 7s. 6d. *net. Fcap.* 8vo. *Cloth,* 6s. *net. Leather,* 7s. 6d. *net.* Service Edition. Two volumes each book. *Square Fcap.* 8vo. 3s. *net* each volume.

A KIPLING ANTHOLOGY—Verse. *Fcap.* 8vo. *Cloth,* 6s. *net. Leather,* 7s. 6d. *net.*

TWENTY POEMS FROM RUDYARD KIPLING. 447*th Thousand. Fcap.* 8vo. 1s. *net.*

A CHOICE OF SONGS. *Second Edition. Fcap.* 8vo. 2s. *net.*

Lamb (Charles and Mary)
THE COMPLETE WORKS. Edited by E. V. LUCAS. A New and Revised Edition in Six Volumes. With Frontispieces. *Fcap.* 8vo. 6s. *net each.* The volumes are: I. MISCELLANEOUS PROSE. II. ELIA AND THE LAST ESSAYS OF ELIA. III. BOOKS FOR CHILDREN. IV. PLAYS AND POEMS. V. and VI. LETTERS.

SELECTED LETTERS. Chosen and Edited by G. T. CLAPTON. *Fcap.* 8vo. 3s. 6d. *net.*

THE CHARLES LAMB DAY BOOK. Compiled by E. V. LUCAS. *Fcap.* 8vo. 6s. *net.*

Lankester (Sir Ray)
SCIENCE FROM AN EASY CHAIR. SCIENCE FROM AN EASY CHAIR: Second Series. DIVERSIONS OF A NATURALIST. GREAT AND SMALL THINGS. Illustrated. *Crown* 8vo. 7s. 6d. *net.* SECRETS OF EARTH AND SEA. Illustrated. *Crown* 8vo. 8s. 6d. *net.*

Lodge (Sir Oliver)
MAN AND THE UNIVERSE (*Twentieth Edition*). THE SURVIVAL OF MAN (*Seventh Edition*). *Each Crown* 8vo. 7s. 6d. *net*. RAYMOND (*Thirteenth Edition*). *Demy* 8vo. 10s. 6d. *net*. RAYMOND REVISED. *Crown* 8vo. 6s. *net*. RELATIVITY (*Fourth Edition*). *Fcap.* 8vo. 1s. *net*.

Lucas (E. V.)
THE LIFE OF CHARLES LAMB. 2 Vols. £1 1s. *net*. EDWIN AUSTIN ABBEY, R.A. 2 Vols. £6 6s. *net*. VERMEER OF DELFT. 10s. 6d. *net*. A WANDERER IN ROME. A WANDERER IN HOLLAND. A WANDERER IN LONDON. LONDON REVISITED (Revised). A WANDERER IN PARIS. A WANDERER IN FLORENCE. A WANDERER IN VENICE. *Each* 10s. 6d. *net*. A WANDERER AMONG PICTURES. 8s. 6d. *net*. E. V. LUCAS'S LONDON. £1 *net*. INTRODUCING LONDON. 2s. 6d. *net*. THE OPEN ROAD. 6s. *net*. Also, Illustrated. 10s. 6d. *net*. Also, India Paper. *Leather*, 7s. 6d. *net*. THE FRIENDLY TOWN. FIRESIDE AND SUNSHINE. CHARACTER AND COMEDY. *Each* 6s. *net*. THE GENTLEST ART. 6s. 6d. *net*. *And* THE SECOND POST. 6s. *net*. Also, together in one volume 7s. 6d. *net*. HER INFINITE VARIETY. GOOD COMPANY. ONE DAY AND ANOTHER. OLD LAMPS FOR NEW. LOITERER'S HARVEST. CLOUD AND SILVER. A BOSWELL OF BAGHDAD. 'TWIXT EAGLE AND DOVE. THE PHANTOM JOURNAL. GIVING AND RECEIVING. LUCK OF THE YEAR. ENCOUNTERS AND DIVERSIONS. ZIGZAGS IN FRANCE. EVENTS AND EMBROIDERIES. 365 DAYS (AND ONE MORE). *Each* 6s. *net*. SPECIALLY SELECTED. 5s. *net*. URBANITIES, 7s. 6d. *net*. *Each* illustrated by G. L. STAMPA. YOU KNOW WHAT PEOPLE ARE. Illustrated by GEORGE MORROW. 5s. *net*. THE SAME STAR: A Comedy in Three Acts. 3s. 6d. *net*. THE BRITISH SCHOOL. 6s. *net*. LITTLE BOOKS ON GREAT MASTERS. *Each* 5s. *net*. ROVING EAST AND ROVING WEST. 5s. *net*. PLAYTIME AND COMPANY. 7s. 6d. *net*. See also **Dolls' House (The Queen's)** and **Lamb (Charles)**

Lynd (Robert)
THE MONEY BOX. THE ORANGE TREE. THE LITTLE ANGEL. *Each Fcap.* 8vo. 6s. *net*. THE BLUE LION. THE PEAL OF BELLS. *Each Fcap.* 8vo. 3s. 6d. *net*.

Marie Louise (H.H. Princess)
A CHOICE OF CAROLS. *Fcap.* 4to. 2s. 6d. *net*. LETTERS FROM THE GOLD COAST. Illustrated. *Demy* 8vo. 16s. *net*.

McDougall (William)
AN INTRODUCTION TO SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY (*Twentieth Edition, Revised*). 10s. 6d. *net*. NATIONAL WELFARE AND NATIONAL DECAY. 6s. *net*. AN OUTLINE OF PSYCHOLOGY *Third Edition*). 12s. *net*. AN OUTLINE OF ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY. 15s. *net*. BODY AND MIND (*Fifth Edition*). THE CONDUCT OF LIFE. Each 12s. 6d. *net*. ETHICS AND SOME MODERN WORLD PROBLEMS (*Second Edition*). 7s. 6d. *net*.

Mackenzie-Rogan (Lt.-Col. J.)
FIFTY YEARS OF ARMY MUSIC. Illustrated. *Demy* 8vo. 15s. *net*.

Maeterlinck (Maurice)
THE BLUE BIRD. 6s. *net*. Also, Illustrated by F. CAYLEY ROBINSON. 10s. 6d. *net*. MARY MAGDALENE. 2s. *net*. DEATH. 3s. 6d. *net*. OUR ETERNITY. 6s. *net*. THE UNKNOWN GUEST. 6s. *net*. POEMS. 5s. *net*. THE WRACK OF THE STORM. 6s. *net*. THE MIRACLE OF ST. ANTHONY. 3s. 6d. *net*. THE BURGOMASTER OF STILEMONDE. 5s. *net*. THE BETROTHAL. 6s. *net*. MOUNTAIN PATHS. 6s. *net*. THE STORY OF TYLTYL. £1 1s. *net*. THE GREAT SECRET. 7s. 6d. *net*. THE CLOUD THAT LIFTED and THE POWER OF THE DEAD. 7s. 6d. *net*.

Masefield (John)
ON THE SPANISH MAIN. 8s. 6d. *net*. A SAILOR'S GARLAND. 6s. *net and* 3s. 6d. *net*. SEA LIFE IN NELSON'S TIME. 5s. *net*.

Methuen (Sir A.)
AN ANTHOLOGY OF MODERN VERSE. 122*nd Thousand*.
SHAKESPEARE TO HARDY: An Anthology of English Lyrics. 19*th Thousand*. *Each Fcap.* 8vo. *Cloth*, 6s. *net*. *Leather*, 7s. 6d. *net*.

Milne (A. A.)
NOT THAT IT MATTERS. IF I MAY. THE SUNNY SIDE. THE RED HOUSE MYSTERY. ONCE A WEEK. THE HOLIDAY ROUND. THE DAY'S PLAY. *Each* 3s. 6d. *net*. WHEN WE WERE VERY YOUNG. *Fourteenth Edition*. 130*th Thousand*. WINNIE-THE-POOH. *Fourth Edition*. 70*th Thousand*. Each Illustrated by E. H. SHEPARD. 7s. 6d. *net*. Leather, 10s. 6d. *net*. FOR THE LUNCHEON INTERVAL. 1s. 6d. *net*

Milne (A. A.) and Fraser-Simson (H.)
FOURTEEN SONGS FROM "WHEN WE WERE VERY YOUNG." (*Tenth Edition.* 7s. 6d. *net.*) TEDDY BEAR AND OTHER SONGS FROM "WHEN WE WERE VERY YOUNG." (7s. 6d. *net.*) THE KING'S BREAKFAST. (*Second Edition.* 3s. 6d. *net.*) Words by A. A. Milne. Music by H. Fraser-Simson.

Montague (C. E.)
DRAMATIC VALUES. Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d. *net.*

Morton (H. V.)
THE HEART OF LONDON. 3s. 6d. *net.* (Also illustrated, 7s. 6d. *net.*) THE SPELL OF LONDON. THE NIGHTS OF LONDON. *Each* 3s. 6d. *net.* THE LONDON YEAR. IN SEARCH OF ENGLAND. Each Illustrated. 7s. 6d. *net.*

Newman (Tom)
HOW TO PLAY BILLIARDS. *Second Edition.* Illustrated. Cr. 8vo. 8s. 6d. *net.* BILLIARD DO'S AND DON'TS. 2s. 6d. *net.*

Oman (Sir Charles)
A HISTORY OF THE ART OF WAR IN THE MIDDLE AGES, A.D. 378–1485. *Second Edition,* Revised and Enlarged. 2 Vols. Illustrated. *Demy* 8vo. £1 16s. *net.*

Oxenham (John)
BEES IN AMBER. *Small Pott* 8vo. 2s. *net.* ALL'S WELL. THE KING'S HIGHWAY. THE VISION SPLENDID. THE FIERY CROSS. HIGH ALTARS. HEARTS COURAGEOUS. ALL CLEAR! *Each Small Pott* 8vo. *Paper,* 1s. 3d. *net. Cloth,* 2s. *net.* WINDS OF THE DAWN. 2s. *net.*

Perry (W. J.)
THE ORIGIN OF MAGIC AND RELIGION. THE GROWTH OF CIVILIZATION (*Second Edition*). *Each* 6s. *net.* THE CHILDREN OF THE SUN. 18s. *net.*

Petrie (Sir Flinders)
A HISTORY OF EGYPT. In 6 Volumes.
Vol. I. FROM THE 1ST TO THE XVITH DYNASTY. *Eleventh Edition, Revised.* 12s. *net.*
Vol. II. THE XVIITH AND XVIIITH DYNASTIES. *Seventh Edition, Revised.* 9s. *net.*
Vol. III. XIXTH TO XXXTH DYNASTIES. *Third Edition.* 12s. *net.*
Vol. IV. PTOLEMAIC EGYPT. By EDWYN BEVAN. 10s. 6d. *net.*
Vol. V. EGYPT UNDER ROMAN RULE. By J. G. MILNE. *Third Edition, Revised.* 12s. *net.*
Vol. VI. EGYPT IN THE MIDDLE AGES. By STANLEY LANE POOLE. *Fourth Edition.* 10s. *net.*

Raleigh (Sir Walter)
THE LETTERS OF SIR WALTER RALEIGH. Edited by LADY RALEIGH. Two Vols. Illustrated. *Second Edition Demy* 8vo. £1 10s. *net.*

Ridge (W. Pett) and Hoppé (E. O.)
LONDON TYPES: TAKEN FROM LIFE. The text by W. PETT RIDGE and the 25 Pictures by E. O. HOPPÉ. *Large Crown* 8vo. 10s. 6d. *net.*

Smith (Adam)
THE WEALTH OF NATIONS. Edited by EDWIN CANNAN. 2 Vols. *Demy* 8vo. £1 5s. *net.*

Smith (C. Fox)
SAILOR TOWN DAYS. SEA SONGS AND BALLADS. A BOOK OF FAMOUS SHIPS. SHIP ALLEY. *Each,* illustrated, 6s. *net.* FULL SAIL. Illustrated. 5s. *net.* TALES OF THE CLIPPER SHIPS. 5s. *net.* THE RETURN OF THE "CUTTY SARK." Illustrated. 3s. 6d. *net.* A BOOK OF SHANTIES. 6s. *net.*

Sommerfeld (Arnold)
ATOMIC STRUCTURE AND SPECTRAL LINES. £1 12s. *net.* THREE LECTURES ON ATOMIC PHYSICS. 2s. 6d. *net.*

Stevenson (R. L.)
THE LETTERS. Edited by Sir SIDNEY COLVIN. 4 Vols. *Fcap.* 8vo. *Each* 6s. *net.*

Surtees (R. S.)
HANDLEY CROSS. MR. SPONGE'S SPORTING TOUR. ASK MAMMA. MR. FACEY ROMFORD'S HOUNDS. PLAIN OR RINGLETS? HILLINGDON HALL. *Each* illustrated, 7s. 6d. *net.* JORROCKS'S JAUNTS AND JOLLITIES. HAWBUCK GRANGE. *Each,* illustrated, 6s. *net.*

Taylor (A. E.)
PLATO: THE MAN AND HIS WORK. *Demy* 8vo. £1 1s. *net.*

Tilden (W. T.)
THE ART OF LAWN TENNIS. SINGLES AND DOUBLES. *Each,* illustrated, 6s. *net.* THE COMMON SENSE OF LAWN TENNIS. Illustrated. 5s. *net.*

Tileston (Mary W.)
DAILY STRENGTH FOR DAILY NEEDS. 32*nd Edition.* 3s. 6d. *net. India Paper, Leather,* 6s. *net.*

Underhill (Evelyn)
MYSTICISM (*Eleventh Edition*). 15s. *net.* THE LIFE OF THE SPIRIT AND THE LIFE OF TO-DAY (*Sixth Edition*). 7s. 6d. *net.* CONCERNING THE INNER LIFE (*Fourth Edition*). 2s. *net.*

Vardon (Harry)
HOW TO PLAY GOLF. Illustrated. *19th Edition. Crown* 8vo. *5s. net.*

Waterhouse (Elizabeth)
A LITTLE BOOK OF LIFE AND DEATH. *22nd Edition. Small Pott* 8vo. *2s. 6d. net.*

Wilde (Oscar).
THE WORKS. In 16 Vols. *Each* 6s. 6d. *net.*
I. LORD ARTHUR SAVILE'S CRIME AND THE PORTRAIT OF MR. W. H. II. THE DUCHESS OF PADUA. III. POEMS. IV. LADY WINDERMERE'S FAN. V. A WOMAN OF NO IMPORTANCE. VI. AN IDEAL HUSBAND. VII. THE IMPORTANCE OF BEING EARNEST. VIII. A HOUSE OF POMEGRANATES. IX. INTENTIONS. X. DE PROFUNDIS AND PRISON LETTERS. XI. ESSAYS. XII SALOMÉ, A FLORENTINE TRAGEDY, and LA SAINTE COURTISANE. XIII. A CRITIC IN PALL MALL. XIV. SELECTED PROSE OF OSCAR WILDE. XV. ART AND DECORATION. XVI. FOR LOVE OF THE KING. (*5s. net*)

William II. (Ex-German Emperor)
MY EARLY LIFE. Illustrated. *Demy* 8vo. *£1 10s. net.*

Williamson (G. C.)
THE BOOK OF FAMILLE ROSE. Richly Illustrated. *Demy 4to. £8 8s. net.*

PART II. A SELECTION OF SERIES

The Antiquary's Books
Each, illustrated, *Demy* 8vo. *10s. 6d. net.*
A series of volumes dealing with various branches of English Antiquities, comprehensive and popular, as well as accurate and scholarly.

The Arden Shakespeare
Edited by W. J. CRAIG and R. H. CASE. *Each, wide Demy* 8vo. *6s. net.*
The Ideal Library Edition, in single plays, each edited with a full Introduction, Textual Notes and a Commentary at the foot of the page. Now complete in 39 Vols.

Classics of Art
Edited by J. H. W. LAING. *Each*, profusely illustrated, *wide Royal* 8vo. *15s. net to £3 3s. net.*
A Library of Art dealing with Great Artists and with branches of Art.

The "Complete" Series
Demy 8vo. Fully illustrated. *5s. net to 18s. net each.*
A series of books on various sports and pastimes, all written by acknowledged authorities.

The Connoisseur's Library
With numerous Illustrations. Wide Royal 8vo. *£1 11s. 6d. net each vol.*
EUROPEAN ENAMELS. FINE BOOKS. GLASS. GOLDSMITHS' AND SILVERSMITHS' WORK. IVORIES. JEWELLERY. MEZZOTINTS. PORCELAIN. SEALS.

The Do's and Dont's Series
Fcap. 8vo. *2s. 6d. net each.*
This series, although only in its infancy, is already famous. In due course it will comprise clear, crisp, informative volumes on all the activities of life.
Write for full list

The Faiths: VARIETIES OF CHRISTIAN EXPRESSION. Edited by L. P. JACKS, M.A., D.D., LL.D. *Crown* 8vo. *5s. net each volume.* The first volumes are: THE ANGLO-CATHOLIC FAITH (Rev. Canon T. A. LACEY); MODERNISM IN THE ENGLISH CHURCH (Prof. P. GARDNER); THE FAITH AND PRACTICE OF THE QUAKERS (Prof. R. M. JONES); CONGREGATIONALISM (Rev. Princ. W. B. SELBIE); THE FAITH OF THE ROMAN CHURCH (Father C.C. MARTINDALE, S.J.).

The Library of Devotion
Handy editions of the great Devotional books, well edited. *Small Pott* 8vo. *3s. net and 3s. 6d. net.*

Little Books on Art
Well Illustrated. *Demy* 16mo. *Each 5s. net.*

Modern Masterpieces
Fcap. 8vo. *3s. 6d. each volume.*
Pocketable Editions of Works by HILAIRE BELLOC, ARNOLD BENNETT, E. F. BENSON, G. K. CHESTERTON, JOSEPH CONRAD, GEORGE GISSING, KENNETH GRAHAME, W. H. HUDSON, E. V. KNOX, JACK LONDON, E. V. LUCAS, ROBERT LYND, JOHN MASEFIELD, A. A. MILNE, ARTHUR MORRISON, EDEN PHILLPOTTS, AND R. L. STEVENSON.

Sport Series
Mostly Illustrated. *Fcap.* 8vo. *2s. net to 5s. net each.*
Handy books on all branches of sport by experts.

Methuen's Half-Crown Library
Crown 8vo *and Fcap.* 8vo.

Methuen's Two Shilling Library
Fcap. 8vo.

Two series of cheap editions of popular books.
Write for complete lists

The Wayfarer Series of Books for Travellers
Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d. net each.* Well illustrated and with maps. The volumes are :—Alsace, Czecho-Slovakia, The Dolomites, Egypt, Hungary, Ireland, The Loire, Provence, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Unfamiliar Japan, Unknown Tuscany.

The Westminster Commentaries
Demy 8vo. 8*s.* 6*d. net to* 16*s. net.* Edited by W. LOCK, D.D., and D. C. SIMPSON, D.D.
The object of these commentaries is primarily to interpret the author's meaning to the present generation, taking the English text in the Revised Version as their basis.

THE LITTLE GUIDES

Small Pott 8vo. Illustrated and with Maps

THE 62 VOLUMES IN THE SERIES ARE :—

BEDFORDSHIRE AND HUNTINGDONSHIRE 4*s.* net.
BERKSHIRE 4*s.* net.
BRITTANY 4*s.* net.
BUCKINGHAMSHIRE 4*s.* net.
CAMBRIDGE AND COLLEGES 4*s.* net.
CAMBRIDGESHIRE 4*s.* net.
CATHEDRAL CITIES OF ENGLAND AND WALES 6*s.* net
CHANNEL ISLANDS 5*s.* net
CHESHIRE 5*s.* net
CORNWALL 4*s.* net.
CUMBERLAND AND WESTMORLAND 6*s.* net
DERBYSHIRE 4*s.* net.
DEVON 4*s.* net.
DORSET 5*s.* 6*d.* net
DURHAM 6*s.* net
ENGLISH LAKES 6*s.* net
ESSEX 5*s.* net
GLOUCESTERSHIRE 4*s.* net
GRAY'S INN AND LINCOLN'S INN 6*s.* net
HAMPSHIRE 4*s.* net.
HEREFORDSHIRE 4*s.* 6*d.* net
HERTFORDSHIRE 4*s.* net.
ISLE OF MAN 6*s.* net
ISLE OF WIGHT 4*s.* net.
KENT 5*s.* net
KERRY 4*s.* net
LANCASHIRE 6*s.* net
LEICESTERSHIRE AND RUTLAND 5*s.* net
LINCOLNSHIRE 6*s.* net
LONDON 5*s. net*
MALVERN COUNTRY 4*s.* net.
MIDDLESEX 4*s.* net.
MONMOUTHSHIRE 6*s.* net
NORFOLK 5*s.* net
NORMANDY 5*s.* net
NORTHAMPTONSHIRE 4*s.* net.
NORTHUMBERLAND 7*s.* 6*d.* net
NORTH WALES 6*s.* net
NOTTINGHAMSHIRE 4*s.* net.
OXFORD AND COLLEGES 4*s.* net.
OXFORDSHIRE 4*s.* net.
ROME 5*s.* net
ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL 4*s.* net
SHAKESPEARE'S COUNTRY 4*s.* net
SHROPSHIRE 5*s.* net.
SICILY 4*s.* net.
SNOWDONIA 6*s.* net
SOMERSET 4*s.* net.
SOUTH WALES 4*s.* net.
STAFFORDSHIRE 5*s.* net
SUFFOLK 4*s.* net.
SURREY 5*s.* net
SUSSEX 4*s.* net.
TEMPLE 4*s.* net.
WARWICKSHIRE 5*s.* net
WESTMINSTER ABBEY 5*s.* net
WILTSHIRE 6*s.* net
WORCESTERSHIRE 6*s.* net
YORKSHIRE EAST RIDING 5*s.* net
YORKSHIRE NORTH RIDING 4*s.* net.
YORKSHIRE WEST RIDING 7*s.* 6*d.* net
YORK 6*s.* net